

February 20, 2022
DRAFT

Privacy-Enhancing Development Environment

Tianshi Li

February 2022

Human-Computer Interaction Institute
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Thesis Committee:

Jason I. Hong (Chair), Carnegie Mellon University
Lorrie Faith Cranor, Carnegie Mellon University
Brad Myers, Carnegie Mellon University
Yuvraj Agarwal, Carnegie Mellon University (ISR)
Tadayoshi Kohno, University of Washington

*Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.*

February 20, 2022
DRAFT

Keywords: Privacy, Human-Computer Interaction, Software Engineering, Development Environment, Privacy-Enhancing Developer Support

February 20, 2022
DRAFT

February 20, 2022
DRAFT

Abstract

Data has driven many technological advancements, while the ubiquitous collection and sharing of data have caused a privacy trust crisis in our society. Developers' nuanced understanding of their app's behavior and ability to adjust the app design put them in a critical role in making apps that respect the norms and users' expectations of data use. However, developers are not privacy experts. Developing a privacy-friendly app is often a challenging task due to their lack of 1) awareness of privacy issues, 2) knowledge of privacy best practices, and 3) time for handling privacy requirements. These problems have become more and more salient with the advent of a flurry of privacy requirements from platform providers (e.g., Google Play and Apple App Store) and laws (e.g., GDPR, CCPA), creating urgent needs for designing effective, opportune, and usable privacy support for developers.

Hence, I propose *Privacy-Enhancing Developer Support* as a new area of interest at the intersection of privacy, HCI, and software engineering research. The first challenge is that although there has been some research on developers' challenges for handling privacy requirements, they tend to be more descriptive than prescriptive. Therefore, our community still lacks a clear direction of how to solve the problems. To fill in this gap, I first synthesize developers' needs for designing privacy-enhancing developer support based on my work and past literature to provide a roadmap for future explorations into this problem.

Informed by the identified needs, I demonstrate my exploration into a specific type of solution: *Privacy-Enhancing Development Environment*. I propose *privacy annotation*, a type of structured metadata that embeds privacy information such as data use purposes directly in code. Based on this concept, I designed and implemented plugins for Android Studio, the official Integrated Development Environment (IDE) for Android development, to increase developers' awareness and knowledge of privacy best practices and to reduce the work required for complying with privacy requirements. The overarching design goal is that with one set of annotations, my tools can offer developers various types of privacy support, such as reminding developers of privacy issues while programming and automatically generating privacy user interfaces to enhance data transparency and control for users.

Apple and Google recently announced requirements for developers to create privacy nutrition labels. However, my prior work about how iOS developers created Apple privacy nutrition labels have revealed numerous challenges. In my proposed work, I want to design an IDE plugin (tentatively named *Matcha*) that leverages privacy annotations to help Android developers create accurate privacy nutrition labels. I will propose a unified design of privacy annotation across Coconut, Honeysuckle, and Matcha, so the developers who annotate the code for generating privacy labels can also take advantage of other privacy features. I will conduct survey studies to understand the challenges for Android developers and use the insights to design and implement Matcha. Finally, I plan to evaluate Matcha on annotating an existing app and adding annotations while programming a new app.

February 20, 2022
DRAFT

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Summary of Completed Work	2
1.2	Summary of Proposed Work	3
1.3	Expected Contributions	4
2	Background and Related Work	5
2.1	Privacy Issues for Everyday Users	5
2.1.1	Data Collection Violating Users' Expectations	6
2.1.2	Tensions Between Privacy and Usability	7
2.1.3	Issues with Privacy Notices and Controls	7
2.2	Research on Mitigation Approaches for Users	9
2.2.1	Designing Alternative Formats of Privacy Notices	9
2.2.2	Automated Assistance for Managing Privacy	10
2.3	Regulation and Platform Requirements for Developers	11
2.3.1	GDPR	11
2.3.2	CCPA	12
2.3.3	Privacy Requirements from App Stores	12
2.4	Developer-Centered Research for Security & Privacy	12
2.4.1	Developers' Practices and Challenges for S&P	12
2.4.2	Developer Support for S&P	13
3	Needfinding Studies for Privacy-Enhancing Developer Support	17
3.1	Interviewing Android Developers About Creating Privacy-Friendly Apps	18
3.2	Interviewing iOS Developers About Creating Privacy Labels	18
3.3	Usability Studies About the Privacy Regulation Features for Ad Networks	18
3.4	Analyzing Discussions About Personal Data on r/androiddev	19
3.5	Analyzing Privacy Advice on Stack Overflow	19
3.6	Needs Synthesized from My Work and Prior Literature	19
3.6.1	Improve Accountability	19
3.6.2	Lessen Burden	21
3.6.3	Increase Engagement	23

4 Coconut: An Android Studio IDE plugin For Privacy	25
4.1 Overview	25
4.2 Design of Coconut: An IDE Plugin for Privacy	27
4.2.1 Coconut Use Case	27
4.2.2 Designing Coconut to Promote Privacy-Preserving Personal Data Use	30
4.2.3 Implementation	32
4.2.4 Pilot Study and Feedback	32
4.3 Evaluation Methodology	33
4.3.1 Participants	33
4.3.2 Study Task Design	33
4.3.3 Study Procedure	34
4.3.4 Privacy Policy Evaluation Methodology	35
4.3.5 Research Questions	36
4.4 Results	37
4.4.1 Results of the Warm-up and Main Task Completion Are Similar Between Two Conditions	37
4.4.2 Coconut Can Help Developers Write More Privacy-Preserving Code	37
4.4.3 Coconut Can Help Developers Better Understand an App’s Behavior	38
4.4.4 Coconut Can Help Developers Write Better Privacy Policies	38
4.4.5 Coconut Is Perceived as Useful and Usable	38
4.4.6 Challenges to Handling Personal Data Properly Observed While Programming	40
4.5 Discussion	42
4.5.1 The Value of Privacy Annotations	42
4.5.2 Design Recommendations for Addressing Annotation Maintenance Issues	43
4.5.3 Generalizability of Using Annotations to Enhance Privacy in Other Programming Languages	43
4.5.4 Limitation of the Evaluation Methodology	44
4.5.5 Future Work	44
5 Honeysuckle: Annotation-Guided In-App Privacy Notice Generation	49
5.1 Overview	49
5.1.1 Motivating Example: Library vs. Annotation	51
5.1.2 Background: Why Developers Can’t Implement In-App Privacy Notices Right?	54
5.2 Honeysuckle Design and Implementation	55
5.2.1 Privacy Notice Designs and Rationales	56
5.2.2 Honeysuckle Library-Only Mode	57
5.2.3 Honeysuckle Annotation-Based Code Generation Mode	58
5.2.4 Honeysuckle Implementation	63
5.3 HoneySuckle Evaluation: Comparing the Annotation and Library Approach	65
5.3.1 Participants	65
5.3.2 Control and Test Conditions	66
5.3.3 Procedure	66

5.3.4	Study Environment	67
5.3.5	Quantitative Results (RQ1-3)	67
5.3.6	Qualitative Feedback (RQ4)	68
5.4	Discussion	71
5.4.1	Annotations as a Bridge to Connect Users and Developers	71
5.4.2	Increasing Developers' Incentives to Improve Privacy	72
5.4.3	Limitations of Honeysuckle	73
5.4.4	Future Work: Going Further from Honeysuckle and Privacy Notice Generation	73
6	Proposed Work: Annotation-Guided Privacy Nutrition Label Creation	75
6.1	Overview	75
6.1.1	Background: Privacy Nutrition Label in Major App Stores	76
6.2	Unifying Privacy Annotation Design	77
6.3	Android Developer Survey: Understanding Challenges for Creating Privacy Labels	79
6.3.1	Part I: Examine Developers' Understanding of Terms	80
6.3.2	Part II: Identify Confusing Expressions in Definitions	81
6.4	Creating and Testing Design Prototypes	81
6.5	System Implementation	82
6.6	Matcha Evaluation	83
6.6.1	Use Case #1: Creating Privacy Label for a Completed App	83
6.6.2	Use Case #2: Adding Privacy Annotations While Programming	83
6.7	Proposed Timeline	84
Bibliography		85

February 20, 2022
DRAFT

List of Figures

4.1	The main features of Coconut. A: LocationAnnotation is a customized Java Annotation with certain fields (e.g. “purpose”) that help developers describe how and why the object ‘location’ obtained from the “requestLocationUpdates” API call is used. B: Coconut can give real-time feedback of potential privacy issues (highlighted in purple) and, in some cases, offer a quick fix. Here, the quick fix makes it easy to change the code to only collect coarse-grained location data. C: Coconut also uses these annotations to generate a summary of personal data practices in the app.	26
4.2	Building a run tracking and mapping app with Coconut: When collecting location data for rendering the route on the map, a ‘@LocationAnnotation’ annotation is needed to describe how and why the location data is used.	28
4.3	Building a run tracking and mapping app with Coconut: When sending the routes to the remote server, a ‘@NetworkAnnotation’ annotation is needed to describe how the data is transmitted out of the phone, along with other annotations (e.g. the ‘@LocationAnnotation’) that describe what data may leave the phone at this point and what the purposes are.	29
4.4	The developer can examine the global personal data practices using the PrivacyChecker window. Personal data practices are categorized by data type and whether it leaves the internal runtime environment. All cells that display data use instances are clickable and can help the developer navigate to the corresponding code snippet when they click on it.	30
4.5	The entire @UniqueIdentifierAnnotation is automatically generated because Coconut is pre-programmed with the implicit data collection behavior of Google AdMob library.	31
4.6	Results of the plugin evaluation part of the survey: most developers found Coconut and features of Coconut very useful, and considered the cost of adding annotations as moderate and comparable to existing requirements. The median values of each group of results are marked in the box.	39

5.1 Honeysuckle consists of three components: an IDE plugin, a build system plugin, and a privacy notice library. As illustrated by the flowchart, the three components each play a role at the programming time, the compile time, and the execution time of an app’s life cycle to help developers implement in-app privacy notices. The IDE plugin facilitates developers to annotate the code, and the annotation will later be used to generate privacy notice code. The generated code will be inserted into the app during compile time by my build system plugin. Finally, the generated code calls APIs provided by my library to show privacy notices during runtime.	50
5.2 The top row shows the annotations and UI configuration XML that developers need to add or modify to generate privacy notices. The bottom row shows the five privacy notice features supported by Honeysuckle (“a” through “e”). I use the same number (1 through 5) to indicate which part of the annotation is used to populate which part of the generated UI, and how the configuration XML guides the presentation of the UI. The design of all these features were inspired by proposals from usable privacy research and privacy regulations. These examples demonstrate the breadth of privacy notices that Honeysuckle can generate with <i>one annotation</i> for each data source and sink.	52
5.3 An illustration of code changes required to implement the same in-app privacy notices for two location features using the library and the annotation-based method. In the code, green highlights indicate lines that were added; red indicates lines that are removed; grey indicates lines that are unchanged. Between the two conditions, the dashed lines connect code that conceptually serves the same goal, and the solid line connects the same code. We can see that using annotations substantially reduces the amount of code that developer needs to write. The annotation-based approach also supports a more uniform format while the library-based approach requires developers to handle low-level implementation tasks using different APIs and declare data practices in a different place from the actual sources and sinks (outside the control logic).	53
5.4 This figure demonstrates the main features of the Honeysuckle IDE plugin via an example use case. First, the app developer opens the Privacy UI Integration panel (A-1) to see what code accesses sensitive user data (i.e., data sources) as detected by the plugin. Then she can use the quick-fix “Add Source annotation” (A-2) to add an annotation for each of these sources and complete required fields in the annotation (e.g., purposeName) (A-3) to resolve the “(incomplete)” errors. Similarly, she needs to annotate “sinks” that may store or send sensitive user data off device (B-4) with the help of quick-fixes (B-5). To indicate how data flows, she also needs to explicitly specify all sources (represented by the source annotations) that may reach this sink (B-6). Lastly, she can modify an XML configuration file automatically generated by the IDE plugin to fine tune the UI behavior (C-7). For example, she can adjust whether to show JIT notification for each source and sink to avoid overwhelming users with unimportant notifications (C-8).	60

5.5	This figure demonstrates three types of auto-checks that can be conducted by the Honeysuckle IDE plugin. The general design principle is that the IDE plugin only aims to provide timely reminders to developers about annotations and UI configuration entries that may be invalid or outdated, and expects the developers to take the initiative to fix the issue.	61
5.6	Annotation and IDE design example: Sometimes an app might have helper functions to collect, store, or transmit data, which leads to a tricky case that one sensitive API call can be used for multiple purposes. In this example, the app creates a helper function “writeToFile” that calls a system API “osw.append(text)” to write data to files. However, because the helper function is called from two different contexts which store different data for different purposes, directly adding a @Sink annotation to the “text” variable is not sufficient for distinguishing between these two contexts when the app is running. Therefore, I propose a new annotation @NoSpecificUseCase to allow developers to provide a cue to Honeysuckle to skip the @Sink requirement for the current level of the function call stack, so developers can annotate @Sink for helper function calls to distinguish data use in different contexts.	62
5.7	Honeysuckle system overview. The three colors correspond to the three component: the IDE plugin, the build system plugin, and the library.	63
5.8	NASA-TLX ratings of the Annotation and Library conditions (lower is better). Using the annotation-based approach of Honeysuckle significantly reduces the overall cognitive load as compared to using the library to implement the same runtime privacy notices. The error bars represent the 95% confidence intervals.	68
5.9	Perceived usability ratings of the annotation-based approach and the library (lower is better, 1=extremely likely, 7=extremely unlikely). Overall, the annotation-based approach was perceived as more usable than the library. The error bars represent the 95% confidence intervals.	69
5.10	Perceived usefulness ratings of the annotation-based approach and the library (lower is better, 1=extremely likely, 7=extremely unlikely). Overall, the annotation-based approach was perceived as more useful than the library. The error bars represent the 95% confidence intervals.	69
6.1	An example of iOS’ privacy labels (left) and Android’s tentative design for its forthcoming safety section (right).	76
6.2	Matcha Annotation Definition and Examples	79
6.3	Relationship between Google’s definition and the survey question design. I will extract items from the definition and create a fictional scenario description to test developers’ understanding for each item.	80
6.4	Google’s definition of the data category “App activity”.	81
6.5	A timeline of the plans for completing my proposed work.	84

February 20, 2022
DRAFT

List of Tables

4.1	Privacy issues that can be detected in the current proof-of-concept prototype for the lab study. These issues are detected by combining the code analysis and the annotations completed by the developer. Automatic quickfixes are also provided for developers, which can be applied with one click.	45
4.2	Background information of the lab study participants regarding Android development (yrs of exp: how many years of experience do they have in Android development; active?: whether they were actively working on any Android development project as a software developer; pro?: whether they had worked as a professional Android developer; all apps: how many Android apps they had developed; playstore apps: how many apps were published on the Google Play store; made privacy policy?: whether they had the experience in making privacy policies.)	46
4.3	Overview of lab study results. C1-C9 are the nine participants in the control group, and E1-E9 the experimental group using Coconut. Some developers did not complete all the tasks, denoted ‘–’. Practices better for privacy are in bold. The meaning of each column are as follows. “warm-up”: time spent on warm-up task; “main”: time spent on main weather app; “weather loc.”: granularity of location for weather info (fine-grained: about 10m accuracy, coarse-grained: about 100m); “ad loc.”: granularity of location collected by AdMob library; “storage”: whether data stored locally is only accessible to this app (private) or also other apps (public); “UID”: type of unique identifier in the weather app (GUID is custom globally unique IDs. Google Instance ID and GUID are user-resettable, app-level unique identifiers which are recommended. Android ID and Telephony ID are hardware identifiers in some versions of Android which are more privacy invasive. See more at [49])	47
4.4	Percentage of correct answers to factual questions regarding apps’ behavior. For the fraction after the percentage, the denominator indicates the number of people that answered this question, and the numerator indicates the number of people who answered it correctly. The last row (‘Total’) calculates the percentage by directly accumulating the number of total answers and total correct answers in each group.	48
5.1	@Source and @Sink annotation definition in Honeysuckle.	59

February 20, 2022
DRAFT

Chapter 1

Introduction

Data privacy has become an essential social problem of this era. A study by the Pew Research Center in 2019¹ showed that about six-in-ten Americans believed it was not possible to go through daily life without having their data collected by companies and governments, and a majority of Americans felt they had limited understanding and little control over the data collected. Meanwhile, a flurry of privacy scandals happened in recent years echoed the privacy concerns of the general public [44].

Consequently, many stakeholders have taken efforts to combat the privacy concerns in different avenues. Privacy laws such as General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA) were enacted to provide EU and California residents with better privacy protection. Platform providers like Google and Apple have rolled out privacy features for consumers and platform-level policies that impose privacy requirements for developers. Researchers investigated end-users' perceptions and concerns about privacy, which yielded design recommendations and novel technologies for helping users manage their privacy in everyday digital activities such as sharing accounts with partners or colleagues [120, 138], posting on social media [39, 151], or talking to a smart speaker [15, 34, 50].

Developers play an important role in complying with the legal and platform requirements for privacy and in following the design recommendations for building privacy-friendly apps from the ground up. However, as compared to the large body of research that aims to provide better privacy support for users, much less attention has been paid to developers' challenges and needs. Developers are often not privacy experts and may face various challenges for implementing a privacy-friendly app even if they sincerely care about user privacy. These problems have become more and more salient with the advent of a flurry of privacy requirements from platform providers (e.g., Google Play and Apple App Store) and laws (e.g., GDPR, CCPA), creating urgent needs for designing effective, opportune, and usable privacy support for developers.

Hence, I propose *Privacy-Enhancing Developer Support* as a new area of interest at the intersection of privacy, HCI, and software engineering research. The first challenge is that although there has been some research on developers' challenges for handling privacy requirements, they tend to be more descriptive than prescriptive. Therefore, our community still lacks

¹<https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2019/11/15/americans-and-privacy-concerned-confused-and-feeling-lack-of-control-over-their-personal-information/>

a clear direction of how to solve the problems. To fill in this gap, I first applied human-centered methods [109] to investigate developers' perceptions about privacy and their challenges when handling different privacy tasks [85, 88, 91, 145, 146]. Then I synthesize developers' needs for designing privacy-enhancing developer support based on my work and past literature to provide a roadmap for future explorations into this problem. The needs consist of three themes: 1) Improve accountability, namely to help developers set actionable goals for privacy and clarify and track their responsibilities; 2) Lessen Burden, namely to either offload or streamline privacy tasks for developers; 3) Increase Engagement, namely to remind developers to actively reflect on and improve their privacy practices and provide compelling incentives for voluntary adoption of privacy-enhancing tools. My developer studies and the three themes of developers' needs are summarized in Chapter 3.

Informed by the identified needs, I demonstrate my exploration into a specific type of solution: *Privacy-Enhancing Development Environment*. I propose *privacy annotation*, a type of structured metadata that embeds privacy information such as data use purposes directly in code. Based on this concept, I designed and implemented plugins for Android Studio, the official Integrated Development Environment (IDE) for Android development, to increase developers' awareness and knowledge of privacy best practices and to reduce the work required for complying with privacy requirements.

The overarching design goal of my privacy-enhancing IDE plugins is that with one set of annotations, my tools can offer developers various types of privacy support, such as reminding developers of privacy issues and offering quick-fixes for the issues while programming (see my tool *Coconut* [85], detailed in Chapter 4) and automatically generating privacy user interfaces to enhance data transparency and control for users (see my tool *Honeysuckle* [90], detailed in Chapter 5). In my proposed work, I plan to design and implement an IDE plugin, *Matcha*, which can help Android developers comply with Google's requirements for privacy nutrition labels accurately and efficiently. With a unified privacy annotation, developers who install the plugin and annotate their code for creating privacy nutrition labels can also take advantage of the privacy features offered by the other two systems.

In the following, I briefly summarize the two completed tools, Coconut and Honeysuckle, the motivations and plans for the proposed work, and the expected contributions of my dissertation.

1.1 Summary of Completed Work

Coconut: An IDE Plugin for Developing Privacy-Friendly Android Apps

My research [85, 88] showed developers had passive attitudes towards privacy issues and had partial and vague understandings of privacy. These issues suggest the need for tooling to keep developers better engaged in protecting user privacy, which inspired my first work, Coconut, an IDE plugin to help developers build privacy-friendly Android apps [85]. Coconut detects sensitive API calls and helps developers add auto-filled privacy annotations. It offers real-time privacy suggestions and quick-fixes based on the privacy annotations. The privacy overview panel aggregates privacy information from annotations to help developers manage all data practices in one place. My developer study showed that adding privacy annotations were perceived as easy

and helpful. The privacy suggestions effectively reduced excessive data use based on Android best practices. The privacy overview panel helped developers precisely recall their apps' data practices and write more accurate privacy policies.

Honeysuckle: Annotation-Guided Code Generation of In-App Privacy Notices

Developers' lack of privacy knowledge has resulted in low adoption of in-app privacy notice and dark patterns in privacy notice design [85, 90], suggesting the need for tooling to automate privacy tasks to mitigate developer's workload, such as designing and implementing privacy UIs. Hence, I designed and built Honeysuckle [90], a developer tool that leverages privacy annotations to generate code for multiple designs of privacy notice UIs. This approach also promotes the standardization of privacy notices because of the consistency of the generated UIs. Honeysuckle contains an IDE plugin subsystem based on Coconut and directly interacts with developers. In a lab study, developers created in-app privacy notices much faster with a significantly lower cognitive load using Honeysuckle's annotation-based code generation than manually writing API calls. Honeysuckle allows developers without expert privacy knowledge to create privacy notices following the best practices with little extra work. Having developers focus on what rather than how, Honeysuckle demonstrates a viable path to promote standard privacy notice designs, making it easier for users to compare privacy practices across apps.

1.2 Summary of Proposed Work

Up to now, my completed work has demonstrated the potential of helping developers build apps that better protect user privacy using two key techniques: privacy annotations and IDE plugins for privacy [85, 90]. Additionally, my developer-centered studies uncovered the challenges and pain points that developers have for complying with the ever-changing, burdensome privacy requirements from laws or platforms [85, 89, 91]. The two lines of work have alluded to a strategy for enhancing data privacy by leveraging developers' knowledge and abilities about their apps. Namely, I want to provide developers with incentives to add privacy annotations by building tools that use these annotations to reduce the work for complying with privacy requirements.

My proposed work aims to help Android developers comply with the platform requirements of filling out privacy nutrition labels by generating them using privacy annotations. My past work has demonstrated that it is a challenging task for iOS developers to create accurate privacy labels and update them on time [91, 93], therefore I consider that Android developers would also need better support to streamline this process and fill out the form accurately.

By observing and interviewing iOS developers [91], I identified three types of recurring errors that can potentially be addressed with code analysis and better developer tool design: 1) the misunderstanding of terms used in privacy labels, 2) the misunderstanding of the data practices of third-party libraries, and 3) failing to recall the app's own data practices. For the first type of error, since Google and Apple use different terms and definitions, I plan to conduct a survey study to systematically study Android developers' perceptions of Google's terms and definitions and identify common misunderstandings as opportunities for improving accuracy by actively reminding developers about them. Then I plan to create and test design prototypes for Matcha to

make sure the interaction design is easy to understand and use. Next, I will implement Matcha as an IDE plugin by extending Coconut and Honeysuckle.

Finally, I plan to conduct lab-based studies and field studies to evaluate two main scenarios of using Matcha to create a privacy nutrition label. The first scenario is to create the privacy label for a completed app, when developers may be affected by the information overload issue [91] because they need to provide information about all the data practices of the app at one time. The second scenario is to create the privacy label by adding privacy annotations while programming. Although developers only need to focus on one data use instance at a time, they need to deal with the cost of context switching between implementing features and adding privacy annotations. These studies will help provide an in-depth understanding of whether Matcha can help developers create more accurate privacy nutrition labels, what implications Matcha may have on developers' time performance of the task and their cognitive load, and developers' subjective perceptions of Matcha, privacy annotations, and privacy-enhancing development environment in general.

1.3 Expected Contributions

- Empirically synthesized design needs for privacy-enhancing developer support aimed to inspire more innovations in this design space.
- The design, implementation and evaluation of three IDE plugins that address different developers' needs for privacy.
- A unified design of privacy annotations for all three IDE plugins for privacy, which can serve as a prototype of a standardized privacy annotation design.

Chapter 2

Background and Related Work

Portions of this chapter were adapted from my published papers:

Li, Tianshi, Yuvraj Agarwal, and Jason I. Hong. “Coconut: An IDE plugin for developing privacy-friendly apps.” Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies 2.4 (2018): 1-35.

Li, Tianshi, et al. “Honeysuckle: Annotation-guided code generation of in-app privacy notices.” Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies 5.3 (2021): 1-27.

This chapter summarizes the background and related work that motivated and inspired my dissertation research in the following structure. First, I introduce prior literature that identified privacy issues for everyday users. I also mention users’ current coping strategies and their limitations, alluding to opportunities that better engagement of developers may generate better solutions. Then, I summarize prior research that proposed design or technological methods to better protect users (Section 2.2) and recent efforts from legislature and platforms (e.g., Google and Apple) for regulating developers’ use of sensitive data (Section 2.3). As I discuss their benefits, I also highlight the inherent limitations of the two directions due to the lack of input from developers and the lack of scaffolding for developers. Finally, I summarize prior research on developers’ practices and challenges when dealing with security and privacy requirements and discuss existing developer support for security and privacy. Most of them are focused on the security side of the problem, which has very different needs from privacy.

2.1 Privacy Issues for Everyday Users

Privacy is a crucial challenge for our society. According to a recent study conducted by Pew Research Center [1], roughly six-in-ten Americans believe “it is not possible to go through daily life without having their data collected” and over eighty percent of Americans felt they had little/no control over their data collected by companies and the government. To regain users’ trust, it is necessary to establish a thorough understanding of the main privacy issues for everyday

users and how users cope with these issues. In this section, I discuss three main issues: violations of users' expectations, tensions between privacy and usability, and issues with privacy notices and controls.

2.1.1 Data Collection Violating Users' Expectations

Users need to have a clear understanding of how their data is collected, used, and shared and have a correct estimate of the corresponding privacy risks. However, this task can be very challenging for users for various reasons.

According to the contextual integrity theory [113], the legitimacy of data flows depends on the contexts characterized by an array of attributes, including the data subject, the data type, the sender, and receivers of the data, and the transmission principles. This means that users need to know a lot of detailed information, including but not limited to what data is collected, for what purposes, how the data is processed, whether it is retained and associated with personally identifiable information (PII), and whether it is shared with any third parties. However, many users do not have sufficient technical literacy to understand all of these data practices. Kang et al. [75] conducted a study about people's mental models of the Internet and found that people without an education background in computer science or related fields had simpler models of the Internet and correspondingly perceived fewer privacy threats.

Using data for purposes different from users' expectations is a common type of violation of users' expectations for privacy. Lin et al. [94] introduced *privacy as expectations* as a model for privacy and observed via a crowdsourcing study that users' perceived necessity of an app accessing a specific type of data had a strong correlation with the users' perceived comfort level of granting the app access to the data. However, research has also shown that while some data collection may have a seemingly legitimate reason, they may also be used for other purposes that surprise users or even creep users out [94, 134].

The lack of awareness for the actual data practices has led to a myriad of high-profile privacy scandals. For example, the famous Facebook–Cambridge Analytica data scandal [7] can be attributed to several types of violation of expectations. First, when the user installed the personality quiz app, they may not realize that a lot of information, including that of their friends, was shared with the third-party app. Second, while they initially installed the app for taking personality tests, the data was later used for a different purpose – political advertising.

Note that the violation of expectations could happen for a seemingly legitimate data use. In 2019, Google [8] and Apple [2] both acknowledged that contractors could listen to audio clips collected by their voice assistants that may include sensitive information about the users. Although the goal was to improve the transcription quality, this type of data sharing practices still felt very surprising to general users, especially for people who are less familiar with the process of the development process of a machine learning model.

Lacking correct expectations of data practices has negative implications on users, including not being able to make informed decisions on whether to disclose sensitive information or grant access to sensitive resources. It may also have a negative impact on developers as users may choose to err on the side of caution and do not share data if they do not understand the reason for collecting it [31]. Developers have the best knowledge about how their apps handle users' data, so they are responsible for providing detailed disclosure about their privacy practices, especially for

the parts that are likely unexpected to users (e.g., the Google and Apple voice assistant example). However, as the complexities of data practices are brought to another level with the proliferation of AI technologies and digital devices equipped with rich sensors, this is not a simple task for developers.

2.1.2 Tensions Between Privacy and Usability

People often express their privacy concerns, but their actions suggest otherwise – this is known as the *privacy paradox* [82]. The tensions between privacy and usability are one reason that account for users' paradoxical behaviors. Users may be willing to trade off their privacy when the data is necessary to achieve goals that are beneficial to them. For example, my recent research about COVID-19 contact-tracing apps showed that the most popular design choice actually needed to collect more data in a centralized way and therefore more privacy-invasive than other solutions [86]. In a follow-up study, I more explicitly demonstrated that perceived benefits were a stronger motive for people to install the app than better privacy [87]. However, even if the users choose to allow data collection, it does not mean they do it comfortably. As Bonné et al. [31] showed in an experience-sampling study of Android users' decisions with the runtime permission requests, about 10% of the decisions of granting access were made reluctantly.

On the other hand, users sometimes have to trade off usability for privacy. Cobb et al. [39] found that users became app-dependent as they had to adjust their behaviors to manage what is displayed by the online status indicators, such as giving up using the phone just to make they look like they are asleep or at work. Sannon et al. [129] studied how, when, and why people lied online to protect their privacy. Similarly, Kang et al. [75] found users may simply limit or change information shared online to protect their privacy. Privacy concerns have also led to chilling effects [104].

To help users successfully navigate through the complicated trade-offs between privacy and usability, the developers need to build in more flexible and fine-grained choices for users. Unfortunately, users often have to make a difficult choice between privacy and usability. As shown in the controversial news about Google assistant [5], if a user did not want a contractor to listen to their audio recordings, the only way at that time was to give up personalization.

2.1.3 Issues with Privacy Notices and Controls

Privacy policies are required by laws and are currently the essential way for users to learn about the privacy practices of digital services. However, it has long been known that privacy policies are lengthy, vague, full of legalese and hard to understand. In 2008, McDonald and Cranor [103] estimated that it would take an individual 244 hours a year if they wanted to read through the privacy policies of all the sites they visited and 154 hours a year if they skimmed at them. This level of cost means it is virtually impossible for users to gain a complete understanding of how a website or an app uses their data if privacy policies are the only available form of disclosure. In addition to the readability and understandability issue, prior research also uncovered the prevalent errors in privacy policies, including discrepancies between what are stated in the privacy policies and the actual data practices [22, 161] and internal contradictions [21].

For mobile apps, the operating system provides a permission system to protect sensitive resources such as location, microphone, and local storage. Users can see all the permissions requested by the app before installation, which provides them with a straightforward way to learn about what sensitive data may be collected by the app. However, Felt et al. [55] evaluated the Android permission systems and found that only 17% participants paid attention to the permissions during app installation and only 3% correctly answered all the comprehension questions. Because purpose is an important type of information that needs to be provided by developers, Apple requires iOS app developers to specify a purpose description for permissions requested by the app and Google also provides similar recommendations for developers. However, Liu et al. [98] showed only 25% of the sampled Android apps provided rationales. Furthermore, among the rationales provided by developers, a lot of them were either incorrect or did not provide further information than the default permission request message.

For mobile apps, there are many system-level privacy features for improving data transparency and control, such as the runtime permission requests. There are also other features introduced in more recent releases. For example, in iOS, an icon will show up on the notification bar when audio or location recording is ongoing. Another feature is to alert users if an app just copied data from their clipboard. The system also occasionally reminds users of background location access of a certain app [12]. Although these features do improve transparency, the lack of customization of what information is displayed and when and how it is displayed makes them inherently insufficient to accommodate the varying privacy preferences among different people [95] and under different contexts [94].

Some apps and websites provide internal privacy settings, while prior research has also identified numerous usability issues with them. One problem is their poor discoverability. Chen et al. [35] found in a user study that 47.12% of the privacy settings of the sampled apps were difficult to find and 9.64% could not be located by any participant. Their further analysis revealed the poor discoverability was mainly due to the problematic hierarchy of the apps' user interface and the confusing descriptions. Similarly, Habib et al. [61] studied the data deletion and out-opt choices displayed on 150 websites and found that privacy choices were located inconsistently across websites and may be confusing and difficult to use. These studies suggest that although the app-level or website-level privacy settings may provide more customized privacy controls, the usability issues made it difficult for users to take advantage of them. Besides, achieving standardization in the design and placement of these privacy settings may be a promising direction to improve their usability, which is later explored in my work *Honeysuckle*, a tool for generating privacy interfaces based on developer-specified annotations [90].

Another usability issue of the internal privacy settings lies in correctly configuring them. The default values often allowed for more data collection, and Krsek et al. [83] showed that reflective writing made Facebook users more likely to select more private configuration settings than the default settings. This suggests that developers should either choose more privacy-friendly default values or employ techniques to help users make the best choice that balance their need for privacy and utility.

All in all, current privacy notices and controls still fall short providing users with enough support for protecting their privacy. To make more helpful privacy notices and controls, we need to leverage developers' rich knowledge about how and why their apps collect user data and their ability to integrate contextualized, fine-grained privacy notices and controls. However, we also

need to regulate and standardize their implementation to ensure the privacy interfaces that they help generate are accurate, consistent, and usable. My tool Honeysuckle [90] mainly aims to tackle this problem (detailed in Chapter 5).

2.2 Research on Mitigation Approaches for Users

This section provides an overview of past research that proposed design or technological approaches to tackle the above privacy issues. Although most of these proposals have not been deployed on a large scale, they provide insights into the pros and cons of different methods and shed light on how to solve these privacy issues. I also discuss to what extent developers need to be involved to achieve the goal.

2.2.1 Designing Alternative Formats of Privacy Notices

To improve data transparency and control, researchers have proposed other formats of privacy notices beyond privacy policies and the permission systems.

Standardized Privacy Notices

Website privacy policies are well known for being long and difficult to read [71, 103]. To make it easier for users to quickly glean important information from those policies and to compare privacy practices between websites, researchers have explored multiple ways to offer privacy summaries that are standardized, succinct, and both human-readable and machine readable.

Privacy Preferences Platform (P3P) is an early exploration of this idea by the World Wide Web Consortium [41]. The goal was to let website developers specify their privacy practices in a standard machine-readable format, so users can specify their privacy preferences for one time and use their agents to automate their decisions every time they visit a website. However, this attempt was not successful largely because it depends on self-regulation and developers could provide incorrect information or simply do not prepare the policy file. The annotation idea I proposed and designed with in Coconut [85] (Chapter 4) and Honeysuckle [90] (Chapter 5) is to some extent in the same spirit of P3P, but I tried to increase the incentive for adoption by aligning it with existing privacy requirements and improve the accuracy by incorporating some program analysis to check developers' input.

Kelley et al. [78] proposed and evaluated a design for privacy nutrition labels for websites, drawing on lessons from the food nutrition labeling literature such as adopting a standardized and brief format. Kelley et al. [79] evaluated the proposed privacy label design, comparing it with shorter tabular and text variants as well as traditional long privacy policies in a large-scale randomized controlled trial. The researchers found that standardized labels could increase both speed of finding information and accuracy of users' comprehension. They found that privacy labels allowed users to better compare policies, and users found standardized formats more enjoyable to read.

In 2013, Kelley et al. [80] followed up with a privacy nutrition label design for mobile apps, demonstrating that labels presented clearly and at relevant times could affect users' decisions

when choosing between similar apps. Later Emami-Naeini et al. [51] proposed a privacy and security label for Internet of Things devices and showed it could help consumers incorporate privacy and security into their IoT device purchase decisions.

Researchers have also investigated how to maximize the benefits of privacy labels by exploring and evaluating design variants of privacy nutrition labels in multiple dimensions [29, 42, 51, 79, 107, 130, 140]. This line of work has yielded design recommendations for improving the design of privacy nutrition labels.

However, my recent work has shown that developers have numerous challenges in creating privacy nutrition labels [91] accurately and updating them on time [93]. Therefore, my proposed work aims to tackle this problem by designing and evaluating an approach to automating the privacy label generation process.

In-App Privacy Notices

Research in usable privacy has argued that effective privacy notices should be concise, contextualized, and emphasize unexpected data practices [59, 94, 124, 130]. I use the term in-app privacy notices to refer to notices that are well-integrated into the app’s interaction flow and customized based on a deep understanding of the app’s design and data practices.

However, designing effective in-app privacy notices is not a trivial task. Several common issues need to be taken into account to achieve a usable and useful design. For example, developers need to reduce the notice complexity by using concise description and plain language, mainly for two reasons. First, prior research has found that it takes a great deal of time to read through lengthy privacy policies [103] and understand the data practices and corresponding implications [54]. Second, the limited screen space constrains the amount of information that can be conveyed [130]. Furthermore, developers need to grapple with notice fatigue [130, 131] and habituation [76, 130, 131] by finding a balance between increasing transparency and decreasing disruption. A common approach to addressing these issues is to use multi-layered notices [130] that can first present data practices that are less expected by users initially and further present more information on demand [94]. However, there is no one-size-fits-all definition of unexpected data practices, and developers need to analyze their own app design and conduct user studies to understand the perceptions of different audiences [95, 96].

Prior research has proposed many designs of in-app privacy notices such as just-in-time privacy notices [40] and privacy dashboards that show the access frequency of specific data [20, 27]. My work Honeysuckle [90] supports annotation-guided generation of these features for Android apps (see details in Section 5.2.1).

2.2.2 Automated Assistance for Managing Privacy

Researchers and practitioners have also investigated ways to help users gain better control over their data. One type of these tools focus on avoiding third-party web tracking, including technologies for measuring online tracking behaviours [53] and detecting and preventing the use of cookie-based tracking [6], device fingerprinting [4], and other tracking techniques [127].

For mobile privacy, researchers and practitioners have also explored building privacy managers as third-party apps. Examples include monitoring data collection and alert users about a

data access [19, 38], and monitoring network traffic to alert users about potential leaks of sensitive personal data [126, 137, 139]. Some work has even demonstrated the feasibility to inferring the purposes of data use by analyzing the semantics of the decompiled code [150] or data traffic [72]. Despite the benefits of offering better privacy protection in a plug-and-play manner, these privacy manager apps also have limitations, including 1) performance degradation caused by the overhead of dynamic program analysis or running a VPN to intercept all network traffic, 2) imposing extra privacy risks when allowing a third-party app to monitor data flows and intercept network traffic (though this may have been addressed with native privacy monitoring tools such as the App Privacy Report introduced since iOS 15.2¹), 3) automated analysis has limited ability in inferring fine-grained data usage information, and 4) potentially breaking or compromising the app’s functionality when blocking the data collection or transmission, and anonymizing and obfuscating the data.

Overall, current technologies show great promises in helping protect users from malicious data use and third-party data use, while there is still a large room for improvement regarding helping users manage the first-party data collection practices for benign purposes. A main goal of my dissertation research is to study how to unleash the synergy between developer’s knowledge about how their own apps and technologies that can analyze and infer data practices.

2.3 Regulation and Platform Requirements for Developers

In addition to protective techniques for users, we also witnessed a lot of efforts for regulating developers’ privacy practices over the past five years. Below, I summarize some requirements of the two most impactful privacy laws (GDPR and CCPA) and privacy requirements from the two major mobile app stores.

2.3.1 GDPR

The EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) went into effect on May 25, 2018. It is among the toughest privacy and security law in the world. Upon violations, the EU data protection authorities can impose fine up to €20 million. Organizations are subject to GDPR regardless of where they are located, as long as the collect or process data of EU residents. GDPR involves requirements that cover a wide range of data protection principles and privacy rights. To be GDPR-compliant, organizations must determine the proper lawful basis for data processing and document the basis and communicate them with the data subject. Some requirements are still fairly abstract, making compliance a difficult goal for small-to-medium-sized companies or independent developers.

While GDPR has placed more strict requirements on data controllers and processors, research has shown its limitations and enforcement challenges. For example, the rights for data portability may be misused as weapons to steal other users’ data by issuing fraudulent requests. In addition, although many websites are trying to comply with GDPR requirements by requesting explicit consent for using cookies, many of the consent dialog designs employed dark patterns [30, 114] and caused a lot of hassles for users [46]. Prior research has also found violations of GDPR [112].

¹<https://support.apple.com/en-us/HT212958>

2.3.2 CCPA

The California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA) is a state statute to enhance privacy protection for California residents. CCPA went into effect on January 1, 2020. Similar to GDPR, it secures new privacy rights including the right to know, the right to delete, the right to opt-out, and the right to non-discrimination. Under the right to know, the CCPA requires businesses to give consumers certain information in a “notice at collection”, including a specific requirement for a “Do Not Sell” link if the data may be sold. The CCPA also provides an opt-out icon [3] following recommendations based on user research [43, 62], which can be used by consumers to tell the company to stop selling their data.

2.3.3 Privacy Requirements from App Stores

The Apple App Store and the Google Play store have also announced a series of privacy requirements for developers that want to release apps on their platforms. Although they are not laws, they still have a significant impact on developers as failing to comply with them may cause the app to be banned from the app stores. Both app stores require apps to provide a privacy policy. Recently, these app stores announced further requirements for improving transparency. Drawing on the idea of privacy nutrition label originated from the academia [78, 80], the Apple App Store introduced App Privacy Details in Dec. 2020 and the Google Play Store introduced a forthcoming Google Safety Section in Feb. 2022. Both required to be self-reported by developers.

2.4 Developer-Centered Research for Security & Privacy

Developers have an in-depth understanding of their apps’ behaviors and are responsible for correctly handling privacy requirements throughout the app development process. However, developers are humans, too. They may be susceptible to insufficient abilities and cognitive biases when handling privacy requirements. In addition, they may have limited time for privacy due to the constraints of other factors such as app performance, communication with other colleagues, time pressure, and so on.

To design better privacy-enhancing support for developers, we need to treat them as users and employ human-centered research methods to understand their challenges [109]. This section summarizes prior research that investigated developers’ practices and challenges for security and privacy and existing developer support for enhancing the security and privacy of their apps. Since prior research has shown a strong bias towards security-related studies and tools while having limited understanding about privacy issues, I conducted multiple developer studies focused on privacy, from which (and prior work) I synthesize needs for designing privacy-enhancing developer support in the next chapter (Chapter 3).

2.4.1 Developers’ Practices and Challenges for S&P

To provide proper developer support, we need to understand what accounts for common privacy issues in the Android ecosystem. Research on this topic is growing, but is still at a relatively

early stage and shows a strong bias towards security-related issues.

One fundamental issue relates to how much developers value privacy and how much they pay attention to it. Prior work has found that developers may make design decisions that trade off privacy for better usability or for features they would like to have [17, 26, 63, 99], which may be in contrast to users' actual preferences for more privacy guarantees [133]. Developers also feel that security is the responsibility of other parties [74, 128, 156], which suggests that developers who work independently or in an organization that cannot afford a specialized security team may pay less attention or have a harder time dealing with security issues.

Several researchers have investigated the gap between widely acknowledged principles for data privacy and how developers actually understand privacy. Although most of this work looks at developers outside of Android, the findings should be generalizable for our needs since the studies involved few platform-specific details. For example, Hadar et al. found that developers hold a partial understanding of privacy, mostly limited to security concerns, and the organizational privacy climate was an important factor playing into their perceptions of privacy [63]. Sheth et al. found that developers preferred data anonymization to using privacy policies to reduce privacy concerns, and there exists a large disparity between developers' and users' belief on the same issue [133]. This body of work suggests many developers have a vague and incomplete understanding of what may raise users' privacy concerns and what might actually compromise their privacy.

Some papers drill down into more technical details. One frequently reported issue was that developers may lack knowledge of potential privacy invasions and corresponding coping strategies. For example, many developers are not aware that some advertising and analytics third-party libraries automatically share users' personal data with service providers [28]. This is likely due to poor readability of the privacy policies of third-party services [26] and insufficient exposure to privacy guidelines [28]. A number of papers studied the limitation of existing programming models and developer support, such as program analyzers detecting security vulnerabilities [135, 154, 155], security APIs / personal data APIs [17, 18, 69, 152], and official documentation / other information sources for security [16, 17, 56]. However, most of this body of work focuses solely on security.

Understanding how developers comprehend privacy guidelines and how these principles influence implementation can be useful for informing the design of better developer tools. However, as noted earlier, current work mostly focuses on security, and offers little insight about other aspects of privacy like data retention, purpose limitation, and privacy notices.

2.4.2 Developer Support for S&P

Here, we review past work in developer support for privacy/security, focusing mostly on Android. We also discuss some gaps in these tools.

Documentation and Tutorials for Privacy/Security

Developer support for educating developers of essential privacy principles is primarily limited to privacy guidelines [24, 40, 65, 116, 117, 118, 119, 121, 148] or official documentation from the platform [48]. Although they are carefully designed to be comprehensive and written in plain

language, Balebako et al. [28] found that developers still have a low awareness of them. Acar et al. [16] found that they were harder to use than informal information sources such as QA sites. These sources are also highly distributed, with advice spread out across many guidelines. Lastly, they tend to only offer high-level advice, such as only using sensitive data when necessary, which may not be easy to apply concretely. These issues indicate the need for a better form to educate developers of these privacy principles in practice.

Static Analyzers for Privacy/Security

Several program analyzers have been built to detect security vulnerabilities for Java and Android [36, 102, 110, 123]. However, past work found a lack of adoption of these analyzers [154, 155], suggesting that perceived importance of security and visibility of peer developers using these tools are important factors influencing adoption. Furthermore, these analyzers are mostly used by security experts rather than normal developers [149], echoing past findings that some developers tend to treat security (and likely privacy as well) as the responsibility of specialized teams [74, 128, 156]. There are also information flow analyzers which can detect malicious or unwanted information leaks from an app [23, 52, 60, 84, 115]. However, it is currently unclear how to map these leaks to specific privacy risks, let alone helping developers mitigate those risks.

IDE-Level Support for Privacy/Security

There are some existing IDE plugins for detecting security vulnerabilities in Android [9, 67, 111, 157], which can offer developers real-time feedback on security issues as they are coding, and in some cases even provide developers with a direct solution to fix the problem. There is also some IDE-level support for other privacy-related issues. For example, Android Lint tries to mitigate over-privileged data tracking behaviors by detecting hardware identifier usage, and suggests alternative and more privacy friendly choices like advertising ID or instance ID [9]. However, the amount of IDE-level support to help developers handle other privacy-related issues is much more limited than security issues.

Support for Enforcing Privacy Policy Compliance

Researchers have investigated how to automate compliance checking of privacy policies, much of which relies on manual review. For example, Bing has an internal system[132] that can automatically check code compliance with privacy policies. Researchers have also looked at new programming models for enforcing privacy policies by factoring out specification of security and privacy concerns from the rest of the program [158, 159]. In this line of work, privacy is handled in a top-down approach, with privacy policies first specified and then enforced in the implementation. In contrast, we tackle this problem in a bottom-up way, asking developers to think about and annotate essential information about privacy practices when constructing code. My research showed that Coconut [85] may also help developers make more accurate privacy policies.

Support for Creating Privacy Policies

Privacy policies are required by some laws and by some app stores. Developers can use on-line privacy policy generators (e.g., freeprivacypolicy.com, generateprivacypolicy.com, appprivacy.net) to make privacy policies for their apps. These generators typically step developers through a series of questions, which are often too coarse to capture enough details of the personal data use. Furthermore, in our interviews we found that developers may not have an accurate and up-to-date understanding of their apps' data collection behaviors, suggesting that these tools may not be able to solicit reliable answers. Some programming models [92] are specifically designed to streamline analyzing how personal data is processed, which can be potentially used to help generate privacy policies. My tool Coconut [85] applies a similar idea by reminding the developer to add annotations about how the personal data is used, which could be more accessible to developers and may also promote the adoption of these privacy-friendly programming models.

February 20, 2022
DRAFT

Chapter 3

Needfinding Studies for Privacy-Enhancing Developer Support

Portions of this chapter were adapted from my published papers:

Li, Tianshi, Yuvraj Agarwal, and Jason I. Hong. “Coconut: An IDE plugin for developing privacy-friendly apps.” *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies* 2.4 (2018): 1-35.

Li, Tianshi, et al. “Understanding Challenges for Developers to Create Accurate Privacy Nutrition Labels.” *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 2020.

Li, Tianshi, et al. “How Developers Talk About Personal Data and What It Means for User Privacy: A Case Study of a Developer Forum on Reddit.” *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 4.CSCW3 (2021): 1-28.

Tahaei, Mohammad, Tianshi Li, and Kami Vaniea. “Understanding Privacy-Related Advice on Stack Overflow.” *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies* 1 (2022): 18.

Tahaei, Mohammad, et al. “Charting App Developers’ Journey Through Privacy Regulation Features in Ad Networks.” *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies* 1: 24.

Needs last longer than solutions. [122]

Although there has been some work studying privacy issues from the developer’s perspective, there is little work on the constructive side that aims to design solutions for these issues. To fill this gap, I took the first step to conduct studies that aimed to understand developers’ perceptions, practices, and challenges that are related to privacy [85, 88, 91, 145, 146]. In this chapter, I first briefly overview my studies. Then I introduce design needs derived from the findings of my work and prior literature, synthesized into three themes. The related empirical evidence will be demonstrated when introducing each theme of design need for privacy-enhancing developer support.

3.1 Interviewing Android Developers About Creating Privacy-Friendly Apps

To inform the design of Coconut [85], I first conducted a formative study by interviewing nine Android developers. The goal is to understand the following: how they manage privacy in practice when developing apps, their general understanding of privacy, their mental models for some well-acknowledged data protection principles, and specific steps and practices used for addressing privacy issues. Balebako et al. [28] also conducted interview studies with mobile app developers to study their privacy and security behaviors, which examined developers' perceptions and behaviors regarding privacy using high-level questions. In contrast, I inquired specifically about how apps that our participants had recently developed used personal data, and mapped out these personal data practices to fundamental privacy principles to identify misconceptions and incorrect behaviors for privacy.

3.2 Interviewing iOS Developers About Creating Privacy Labels

Apple announced the introduction of *app privacy details* to their App Store in December 2020, marking the first ever real-world, large-scale deployment of the *privacy nutrition label* concept, which had been introduced by researchers over a decade earlier. The Apple labels are created by app developers, who self-report their app's data practices.

I conducted the first study examining the usability and understandability of Apple's privacy nutrition label creation process from the developer's perspective. By observing and interviewing 12 iOS app developers about how they created the privacy label for a real-world app that they developed, I identified common challenges for correctly and efficiently creating privacy labels.

3.3 Usability Studies About the Privacy Regulation Features for Ad Networks

Mobile apps enable ad networks to collect and track users. App developers are given "configurations" on these platforms to limit data collection and adhere to privacy regulations; however, the prevalence of apps that violate privacy regulations because of third parties, including ad networks, begs the question of how developers work through these configurations and how easy they are to utilize. My colleague and I study privacy regulations-related interfaces on three widely used ad networks using two empirical studies, an expert review and think-aloud sessions with eleven developers, to shed light on how ad networks present privacy regulations and how usable the provided configurations are for developers.

We find that information about privacy regulations is scattered in several pages, buried under multiple layers, and uses terms and language developers do not understand. While ad networks put the burden of complying with the regulations on developers, our participants, on the other hand, see ad networks responsible for ensuring compliance with regulations.

3.4 Analyzing Discussions About Personal Data on r/androiddev

While online developer forums are major resources of knowledge for application developers, their roles in promoting better privacy practices remain underexplored. I conducted a qualitative analysis of a sample of 207 threads (4772 unique posts) mentioning different forms of personal data from the /r/androiddev forum on Reddit. I started with bottom-up open coding on the sampled posts to develop a typology of discussions about personal data use and conducted follow-up analyses to understand what types of posts elicited in-depth discussions on privacy issues or mentioned risky data practices. The results show that Android developers rarely discussed privacy concerns when talking about a specific app design or implementation problem, but often had active discussions around privacy when stimulated by certain external events representing new privacy-enhancing restrictions from the Android operating system, app store policies, or privacy laws. Developers often felt these restrictions could cause considerable cost yet fail to generate any compelling benefit for themselves.

3.5 Analyzing Privacy Advice on Stack Overflow

Privacy tasks can be challenging for developers, resulting in privacy frameworks and guidelines from the research community which are designed to assist developers in considering privacy features and applying privacy enhancing technologies in early stages of software development. However, how developers engage with privacy design strategies is not yet well understood.

My colleague and I look at the types of privacy-related advice developers give each other and how that advice maps to Hoepman's privacy design strategies. We qualitatively analyzed 119 privacy-related accepted *answers* on *Stack Overflow* from the past five years and extracted 148 pieces of advice from these answers. We find that the advice is mostly around compliance with regulations and ensuring confidentiality with a focus on the `inform`, `hide`, `control`, and `minimize` of the Hoepman's privacy design strategies. Other strategies, `abstract`, `separate`, `enforce`, and `demonstrate`, are rarely advised. Answers often include links to official documentation and online articles, highlighting the value of both official documentation and other informal materials such as blog posts.

3.6 Needs Synthesized from My Work and Prior Literature

I envision that privacy-enhancing developer support should ideally address these three themes of needs: 1) Improve Accountability; 2) Lessen Burden; 3) Increase Engagement. In the following, I explicate each theme using concrete examples.

Note that these themes and analysis are still preliminary. A goal for my final dissertation work is to further consolidate these needs and publish them as a standalone paper.

3.6.1 Improve Accountability

Developers are accountable for privacy. However, they face challenges in operationalizing the abstract concept of privacy, having a clear understanding of their responsibilities, and contribut-

ing their knowledge of app behaviors to privacy audits.

Operationalize Privacy

Privacy is a complex, abstract concept, whose definition has been discussed as a longstanding research questions for legal, social science, and computer science scholars. Therefore, it is not surprising that transferring the high-level goal of improving privacy to actual design and implementation tasks is only going to be more challenging for developers.

Prior research has already shown that developers tended to reduce the concept of privacy to security concerns [63]. Sheth et al. [133] mentioned that developers preferred data anonymization to using privacy policies to reduce privacy concerns. My interviews with Android developers further investigated this problem by probing developers' general perceptions of privacy [85]. I found that many participants only considered partial aspects, such as collecting data only when users have fully consent to it, preventing using identifiable information, minimizing data usage, or encrypting or obfuscating data before sending it out of the phone. Most participants have low awareness of privacy concerns related to data sharing and data retention.

This body of work suggests many developers have a vague and incomplete understanding of what may raise users' privacy concerns and what might actually compromise their privacy, which calls for the following design goal for developer support:

Need #1: Developers need actionable goals to tackle the abstract concept of privacy.

Clarify Division of Labor

Privacy involves various types of stakeholders, and sometimes it may get unclear who is responsible for which part. Mhaidli et al. [106] studied app developers' adoption of ad networks and showed that app developers considered ad networks responsible for addressing the privacy risks posed by ads. Therefore, developers keep the default settings in these ad networks without considering the impact on privacy risks and financial benefits. The same issue also manifested in our studies about the privacy regulation-related interfaces of three widely used ad networks [146]. In addition, my studies have repeatedly shown that some developers said they were unconcerned about privacy because it was not their responsibility [85, 91].

To leverage the unique values that developers can offer and also respect the limit of their abilities, a clear division of labor for privacy is needed. In addition to issues that have been relatively well studied in the past such as the relationship between developers and ad networks, further research is needed to analyze how to divide the labour between developers and other entities such designers, privacy engineers, lawyers, and managers, as well as more high-level parties such as app development platforms.

Need #2: Developers need a clear scope of privacy responsibilities.

Support Auditing

Privacy audits are required by laws like GDPR. Currently this type of task is usually led by lawyers and privacy or security compliance teams, while developers also need to participate in this process by filling out forms about how they implemented the actual data practices. However,

my research has shown that developers could also have inaccurate understanding of app behaviors [85, 91] due to 1) insufficient understanding of how some API works, especially ad libraries, 2) having difficulty in tracking changes of data practices across different versions, and 3) lacking documentation of data practices when previous developers have left the team. Therefore, better tools need to be built for helping developers manage data practices and attribute privacy-related changes to specific developers.

Another problem is that current software systems often consists of subsystems written in different languages and using different SDKs. These subsystems may take care of different part of the data flows. For example, a mobile app may have a client app installed on the user device to collect data, a backend server that stores data, and also third-party services that it shares data with and gathers data from. The developers who build and maintain these subsystems may also be different people. To generate an accurate and attributable privacy audit report, it requires great interoperability across these subsystems. The privacy annotations proposed by my work shows a possible direction to solve this problem. These annotations are supported by many programming languages and can be embedded in code so developers can easily add them when coding a new feature. They follow a standard format, so it is also straightforward for each subsystem to generate a machine-readable summary follow a standard form for the entire system.

Need #3: Developers need to participate in privacy audits accurately and efficiently.

3.6.2 Lessen Burden

Developers are not privacy experts [85, 145] and there are many other factors that falls in the developers' responsibilities, such as app performance, communication with other colleagues, and time pressure [85, 91]. By acknowledging these limits in developers' abilities and bandwidths, we need to seek better developer support that can help achieve more privacy benefits when requiring less work.

Offload Privacy Tasks

Currently, laws and platforms define many privacy tasks that need to be handled by developers, while I argue that developers do not have the ability and bandwidth to handle all of them correctly. Fortunately, some tasks only require developers to provide a little information, and the rest of the work can be offloaded to an automated system.

The design of my tool Honeysuckle [90] was directly informed by this idea. With Honeysuckle, developers only need to specify the information that can not be accurately inferred using program analysis techniques (e.g., data use purposes, whether certain data will be transmitted off the device), and the tool will automatically generate a variety of in-app privacy notices using the information. The generated notices can partially fulfill the requirements of laws and the Google Play Store. In this way, developers need to write much less boilerplate code, making the privacy features easier to implement and maintain. In addition to saving on the burden for developers, emancipating developers from handling the design and implementation details and adopting a standardized design made by privacy experts improve the quality of the privacy features.

Need #4: Developers need to be emancipated from privacy-related tasks whenever it is

possible, especially when they do not provide irreplaceable values and when standardization is needed.

Streamline Privacy Tasks

In contrast to tasks that can be offloaded, there are privacy tasks that rely on knowledge in the developer's head and can not be automated. For these tasks, we can provide a guided process to help developers handle them accurate and efficiently.

One example is the two major mobile app stores' requirements for creating privacy nutrition labels in a self-report manner. My research has shown that iOS developers could not accurately report their apps' data practices due to various problems [91, 93]. Interestingly, there are techniques or resources that can mitigate these problems, while it is difficult for developers to find and apply them.

For example, although many widely used third-party libraries such as Google Analytics and the Facebook SDK provided documentation for this task, developers did not know these resources exist, partly because they did not use the right search terms. Furthermore, program analysis techniques can easily detect all data accesses of the app and third-party libraries used by the app. Although this is not sufficient to satisfy all the disclosure requirements, it can greatly streamline the task and prevent inaccuracies due to memory challenges as identified in my studies. Another issue is developers may not promptly update the privacy labels upon changes of data practices because they found the creation process complicated and confusing, and hence did not want to frequently go through it.

In my proposed work, I plan to design an IDE plugin that can leverage these opportunities to help developers generate accurate privacy nutrition labels and make prompt updates for them.

Need #5: Developers need assistance for privacy tasks that must be handled by them.

Reduce Task Overload

While dealing with one requirement is already challenging for developers (e.g., creating privacy nutrition labels), what they are facing in real life is a collection of requirements from different sources (e.g., different privacy laws, requirements from different platforms). This requires us to take a holistic view when estimating the cost for developers caused by privacy requirements.

Since these privacy requirements are mostly driven by the same privacy principles, they are likely to correlate and overlap with each other, such as the introduction of the same idea "privacy nutrition label" by Google and Apple. Nevertheless, because the privacy requirements were often designed independently, the subtle inconsistencies between similar requirements may lead to even more confusions and errors. For example, I noticed that Apple and Google used the same word "data collection" in their privacy label design while they selected very different meanings, which could cause trouble for cross-platform apps to comply with the privacy label requirements of both platforms [91].

Need #6: Developers need support for handling privacy requirements from different sources.

3.6.3 Increase Engagement

Although setting up concrete privacy requirements both directly prompt developers to take actions to protect privacy [88, 143] and help with enforcement, existing privacy requirements and the way they are enforced can not solve all privacy issues, especially when it comes to the complex trade-offs between privacy and usability regarding first-party data practices and the apps' main functionality. Therefore, we need to encourage and support developers to learn more about privacy and reflect more on their data practices to detect privacy issues proactively.

Increase Awareness

As I analyzed the subreddit themed around Android development ([r/androiddev](#)), I found most privacy-related discussions were triggered by external events such as new platform policies regarding privacy, while privacy-related discussions rarely emerged when discussing the design and development of specific apps [88]. The low visibility of privacy-related discussions on an online developer forum is a specific case of the low visibility of privacy in development-related activities in general, which reflects developers' lack of awareness of privacy issues [85], best privacy practices [85], and design strategies to enhance privacy [145]. Overall, developers often lack the awareness about what are potential privacy issues and how to solve these issues.

Education is one direction to address this problem. We can more systematically study how developers learn privacy knowledge and acquire privacy skills and design better curricula and techniques to facilitate the learning process. Another direction is to make privacy a first-class feature in the software development ecosystem to increase its visibility. My tool Coconut explored this idea by providing developers with contextualized reminders of potential privacy issues and suggestions of solutions [85].

Need #7: Developers need to be aware of privacy issues and the corresponding solutions.

Incentivize Adoption

Developers often treat privacy as a secondary consideration [28, 85]. A fundamental challenge for designing privacy-enhancing developer support is there is little incentive for voluntary adoption of tools that help improve privacy. Prior research has identified personal concerns, client or company requirements, platform feedback, and laws and regulations as drivers of privacy questions on Stack Overflow [144] and identified platform policy updates and privacy-related updates in the operating system and developer API and as triggers of privacy-related discussions on [r/androiddev](#) [88]. Therefore, one potential way to incentivize adoption is to leverage these existing drivers. Namely, we can design tools that appeal to these more urgent needs when also provide support that help with other privacy goals.

Another idea is to design support to achieve other primary goals of developers while offering beneficial side effects for privacy. One example is PrivacyStreams [92], which is a programming model that is designed to streamline the use of personal data while simultaneously improve transparency because it is also easier to analyze how the data is processed and what granularity of data is used.

Need #8: Developers need incentives for adopting privacy-enhancing developer support.

February 20, 2022
DRAFT

Chapter 4

Coconut: An Android Studio IDE plugin For Privacy

This chapter was adapted from my published paper:

Li, Tianshi, Yuvraj Agarwal, and Jason I. Hong. “Coconut: An IDE plugin for developing privacy-friendly apps.” *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies* 2.4 (2018): 1-35.

4.1 Overview

Privacy has become a growing concern with today’s smartphone apps, and the need for developers to protect users’ privacy has become more urgent with the advent of new privacy regulations, such as the EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). However, developers still face many challenges in handling privacy, which has resulted in many apps using sensitive personal data in a problematic manner [19, 52, 160]. Prior research has identified various causes of this misbehavior. For example, copying-and-pasting can be convenient, but can also introduce security bugs [56]. Unusable documentation and guidelines result in a lack of awareness and understanding of recommended security practices [16]. Poorly designed security and personal data APIs may incur extra overhead to conform to the principles of data privacy [18, 69, 70, 92]. Perhaps most importantly, developers usually treat privacy as a secondary concern [17, 26, 99], and have an incomplete understanding of what needs to be considered regarding data privacy protection [63].

Researchers and practitioners have developed a number of tools to promote secure coding [37, 101, 111, 136, 157]. However, there is currently little support to help developers in creating privacy-friendly apps. Specifically, how to design usable tools to facilitate certain aspects of privacy (e.g. privacy notices, data retention, and data sharing) has received little attention. Prior work suggests that these under-investigated aspects are indeed areas where developers lack the most awareness and understanding [63].

My overall goal is to create tools to help app developers manage the complex requirements for privacy, especially for those who work independently or in a relatively small organization that cannot afford a privacy team. I first conducted semi-structured interviews with nine Android developers to examine their understanding of privacy and how they deal with privacy issues. Several of my findings echo those from prior work, such as the tendency to de-prioritize privacy-related tasks and being unaware of the personal data automatically shared with some third-party advertising libraries [28]. I also identified additional challenges that have not yet been documented in existing literature. For example, developers may have inaccurate understanding of how their apps handle personal data, due to frequent iterations of the app and lack of documentation in collaboration scenarios.




Figure 4.1: The main features of Coconut. A: LocationAnnotation is a customized Java Annotation with certain fields (e.g. “purpose”) that help developers describe how and why the object ‘location’ obtained from the “requestLocationUpdates” API call is used. B: Coconut can give real-time feedback of potential privacy issues (highlighted in purple) and, in some cases, offer a quick fix. Here, the quick fix makes it easy to change the code to only collect coarse-grained location data. C: Coconut also uses these annotations to generate a summary of personal data practices in the app.

The findings from prior work and my interviews indicate the need for new mechanisms and tools to support privacy when developing apps. Towards this end, I designed and implemented Coconut, an IDE plugin for Android Studio, the most popular IDE for Android development. Figure 4.1 shows a screenshot of Coconut. Coconut uses heuristics to detect code that handles personal data, and asks the developer to add an annotation that describes how and why the personal data is used. Each annotation is a customized Java annotation of key-value pairs, with keys predefined for the specific type of personal data used (see Figure 1A). While programming, Coconut offers real-time feedback on potential privacy concerns by highlighting the annotation. In some cases, Coconut can offer quick fixes that make it easy to directly adopt the recommended practice (see Figure 1B). Lastly, all annotations are gathered in the “PrivacyChecker” summary panel, to facilitate review (see Figure 1C).

I conducted a between-subjects lab study with 18 Android developers to evaluate the usability and effectiveness of Coconut. The results suggest that Coconut could help developers deal with

privacy issues from multiple aspects, such as avoiding violations of privacy principles, gaining more knowledge in the apps' behavior, and providing better privacy notices to end users.

This work makes the following research contributions:

- I systematically examine developers' understanding of privacy practices through a series of semi-structured interviews. My results helped us identify common misconceptions and difficulties with privacy.
- I present the design and implementation of Coconut, an Android Studio plugin for privacy, which nudges developers to think about privacy while programming, improves developers' understanding of the app's personal data use, increases developers' knowledge of alternative options to achieve a better trade-off for privacy, and motivates developers to search and learn about privacy.
- I present the results of my lab studies of Coconut. My results show that developers using Coconut can build more privacy-preserving apps, gain a better understanding of how their app handles personal data, and write better privacy notices for users. I also observed other privacy challenges, such as developers inadvertently introducing privacy issues while tweaking their code for some functionality to work.

4.2 Design of Coconut: An IDE Plugin for Privacy

The goal of Coconut is to get developers to think about privacy and make it a natural part of their app development process. I decided to build my tool as an IDE plugin, thereby enhancing the Android Studio development environment already familiar to, and used by, all developers. I first present a hypothetical use case of my tool, and then describe the design of the plugin along with my design rationale.

4.2.1 Coconut Use Case

Here, I present a fictional scenario to help illustrate how Coconut can help developers write privacy-preserving apps. Ann is developing a run tracking app, and a core feature of this app is to render the current route on the screen in real time, and then upload the route to the remote server database, where it is backed up.

When collecting location data for rendering the route on the map, a '@LocationAnnotation' is needed to describe how and why the location data is used (see Figure 4.2). Ann decides to use the 'requestLocationUpdates' among the series of native 'LocationManager' APIs. After writing the API call in the Android Studio IDE, Coconut uses simple heuristics to detect this API, and requests the developer add a '@LocationAnnotation' annotation to the returned location object. (Figure 4.2a). Ann uses a quickfix to automatically generate an annotation skeleton with several fields (i.e. 'dataType', 'frequency') automatically filled in based on the parameters in the API call (i.e. 'GPS_PROVIDER', min time and distance interval for location updates), while other fields that can not be inferred from the code need to be filled manually. Ann then inspects each of them and fills them out one by one. When she is not sure about what she is supposed to put in a particular field (e.g. 'visibility'), she just hovers on



```

62     manager.requestLocationUpdates(LocationManager.GPS_PROVIDER, minTime: 0, minDistance: 0,
63         new LocationListener() {
64             @Override
65             public void onLocationChanged(Location location) {
66                 ...
67             }
68         }
69     );
70 }
71
72 /**
73  * LocationAnnotation annotation is required. more... (#F1)
74  */
75 @Override
76 public void onLocationChanged(@LocationAnnotation(
77     purpose = {LocationPurpose.UNKNOWN},
78     purposeDescription = {")},
79     dataType = {LocationDataType.FINE_GRAINED_LATITUDE_LONGITUDE},
80     visibility = {Visibility.UNKNOWN},
81     ...
82     "visibility": Is the data used when the app is in background (BACKGROUND) or in foreground (WHILE_IN_USE)? more... (#F1)
83     This value is blank more... (#F1)
84     ...
85     })
86 }
87
88 }
89
90 }
91
92 }
93
94 }
95
96 }
97
98 }
99
100 }
101
102 }
103
104 }
105
106 }
107
108 }
109
110 }
111
112 }
113
114 }
115
116 }
117
118 }
119
120 }
121
122 }
123
124 }
125
126 }
127
128 }
129
130 }
131
132 }
133
134 }
135
136 }
137
138 }
139
140 }
141
142 }
143
144 }
145
146 }
147
148 }
149
150 }
151
152 }
153
154 }
155
156 }
157
158 }
159
160 }
161
162 }
163
164 }
165
166 }
167
168 }
169
170 }
171
172 }
173
174 }
175
176 }
177
178 }
179
180 }
181
182 }
183
184 }
185
186 }
187
188 }
189
190 }
191
192 }
193
194 }
195
196 }
197
198 }
199
200 }
201
202 }
203
204 }
205
206 }
207
208 }
209
210 }
211
212 }
213
214 }
215
216 }
217
218 }
219
220 }
221
222 }
223
224 }
225
226 }
227
228 }
229
230 }
231
232 }
233
234 }
235
236 }
237
238 }
239
240 }
241
242 }
243
244 }
245
246 }
247
248 }
249
250 }
251
252 }
253
254 }
255
256 }
257
258 }
259
260 }
261
262 }
263
264 }
265
266 }
267
268 }
269
270 }
271
272 }
273
274 }
275
276 }
277
278 }
279
280 }
281
282 }
283
284 }
285
286 }
287
288 }
289
290 }
291
292 }
293
294 }
295
296 }
297
298 }
299
299 }
300
300 }
301
301 }
302
302 }
303
303 }
304
304 }
305
305 }
306
306 }
307
307 }
308
308 }
309
309 }
310
310 }
311
311 }
312
312 }
313
313 }
314
314 }
315
315 }
316
316 }
317
317 }
318
318 }
319
319 }
320
320 }
321
321 }
322
322 }
323
323 }
324
324 }
325
325 }
326
326 }
327
327 }
328
328 }
329
329 }
330
330 }
331
331 }
332
332 }
333
333 }
334
334 }
335
335 }
336
336 }
337
337 }
338
338 }
339
339 }
340
340 }
341
341 }
342
342 }
343
343 }
344
344 }
345
345 }
346
346 }
347
347 }
348
348 }
349
349 }
350
350 }
351
351 }
352
352 }
353
353 }
354
354 }
355
355 }
356
356 }
357
357 }
358
358 }
359
359 }
360
360 }
361
361 }
362
362 }
363
363 }
364
364 }
365
365 }
366
366 }
367
367 }
368
368 }
369
369 }
370
370 }
371
371 }
372
372 }
373
373 }
374
374 }
375
375 }
376
376 }
377
377 }
378
378 }
379
379 }
380
380 }
381
381 }
382
382 }
383
383 }
384
384 }
385
385 }
386
386 }
387
387 }
388
388 }
389
389 }
390
390 }
391
391 }
392
392 }
393
393 }
394
394 }
395
395 }
396
396 }
397
397 }
398
398 }
399
399 }
400
400 }
401
401 }
402
402 }
403
403 }
404
404 }
405
405 }
406
406 }
407
407 }
408
408 }
409
409 }
410
410 }
411
411 }
412
412 }
413
413 }
414
414 }
415
415 }
416
416 }
417
417 }
418
418 }
419
419 }
420
420 }
421
421 }
422
422 }
423
423 }
424
424 }
425
425 }
426
426 }
427
427 }
428
428 }
429
429 }
430
430 }
431
431 }
432
432 }
433
433 }
434
434 }
435
435 }
436
436 }
437
437 }
438
438 }
439
439 }
440
440 }
441
441 }
442
442 }
443
443 }
444
444 }
445
445 }
446
446 }
447
447 }
448
448 }
449
449 }
450
450 }
451
451 }
452
452 }
453
453 }
454
454 }
455
455 }
456
456 }
457
457 }
458
458 }
459
459 }
460
460 }
461
461 }
462
462 }
463
463 }
464
464 }
465
465 }
466
466 }
467
467 }
468
468 }
469
469 }
470
470 }
471
471 }
472
472 }
473
473 }
474
474 }
475
475 }
476
476 }
477
477 }
478
478 }
479
479 }
480
480 }
481
481 }
482
482 }
483
483 }
484
484 }
485
485 }
486
486 }
487
487 }
488
488 }
489
489 }
490
490 }
491
491 }
492
492 }
493
493 }
494
494 }
495
495 }
496
496 }
497
497 }
498
498 }
499
499 }
500
500 }
501
501 }
502
502 }
503
503 }
504
504 }
505
505 }
506
506 }
507
507 }
508
508 }
509
509 }
510
510 }
511
511 }
512
512 }
513
513 }
514
514 }
515
515 }
516
516 }
517
517 }
518
518 }
519
519 }
520
520 }
521
521 }
522
522 }
523
523 }
524
524 }
525
525 }
526
526 }
527
527 }
528
528 }
529
529 }
530
530 }
531
531 }
532
532 }
533
533 }
534
534 }
535
535 }
536
536 }
537
537 }
538
538 }
539
539 }
540
540 }
541
541 }
542
542 }
543
543 }
544
544 }
545
545 }
546
546 }
547
547 }
548
548 }
549
549 }
550
550 }
551
551 }
552
552 }
553
553 }
554
554 }
555
555 }
556
556 }
557
557 }
558
558 }
559
559 }
560
560 }
561
561 }
562
562 }
563
563 }
564
564 }
565
565 }
566
566 }
567
567 }
568
568 }
569
569 }
570
570 }
571
571 }
572
572 }
573
573 }
574
574 }
575
575 }
576
576 }
577
577 }
578
578 }
579
579 }
580
580 }
581
581 }
582
582 }
583
583 }
584
584 }
585
585 }
586
586 }
587
587 }
588
588 }
589
589 }
590
590 }
591
591 }
592
592 }
593
593 }
594
594 }
595
595 }
596
596 }
597
597 }
598
598 }
599
599 }
600
600 }
601
601 }
602
602 }
603
603 }
604
604 }
605
605 }
606
606 }
607
607 }
608
608 }
609
609 }
610
610 }
611
611 }
612
612 }
613
613 }
614
614 }
615
615 }
616
616 }
617
617 }
618
618 }
619
619 }
620
620 }
621
621 }
622
622 }
623
623 }
624
624 }
625
625 }
626
626 }
627
627 }
628
628 }
629
629 }
630
630 }
631
631 }
632
632 }
633
633 }
634
634 }
635
635 }
636
636 }
637
637 }
638
638 }
639
639 }
640
640 }
641
641 }
642
642 }
643
643 }
644
644 }
645
645 }
646
646 }
647
647 }
648
648 }
649
649 }
650
650 }
651
651 }
652
652 }
653
653 }
654
654 }
655
655 }
656
656 }
657
657 }
658
658 }
659
659 }
660
660 }
661
661 }
662
662 }
663
663 }
664
664 }
665
665 }
666
666 }
667
667 }
668
668 }
669
669 }
670
670 }
671
671 }
672
672 }
673
673 }
674
674 }
675
675 }
676
676 }
677
677 }
678
678 }
679
679 }
680
680 }
681
681 }
682
682 }
683
683 }
684
684 }
685
685 }
686
686 }
687
687 }
688
688 }
689
689 }
690
690 }
691
691 }
692
692 }
693
693 }
694
694 }
695
695 }
696
696 }
697
697 }
698
698 }
699
699 }
700
700 }
701
701 }
702
702 }
703
703 }
704
704 }
705
705 }
706
706 }
707
707 }
708
708 }
709
709 }
710
710 }
711
711 }
712
712 }
713
713 }
714
714 }
715
715 }
716
716 }
717
717 }
718
718 }
719
719 }
720
720 }
721
721 }
722
722 }
723
723 }
724
724 }
725
725 }
726
726 }
727
727 }
728
728 }
729
729 }
730
730 }
731
731 }
732
732 }
733
733 }
734
734 }
735
735 }
736
736 }
737
737 }
738
738 }
739
739 }
740
740 }
741
741 }
742
742 }
743
743 }
744
744 }
745
745 }
746
746 }
747
747 }
748
748 }
749
749 }
750
750 }
751
751 }
752
752 }
753
753 }
754
754 }
755
755 }
756
756 }
757
757 }
758
758 }
759
759 }
760
760 }
761
761 }
762
762 }
763
763 }
764
764 }
765
765 }
766
766 }
767
767 }
768
768 }
769
769 }
770
770 }
771
771 }
772
772 }
773
773 }
774
774 }
775
775 }
776
776 }
777
777 }
778
778 }
779
779 }
780
780 }
781
781 }
782
782 }
783
783 }
784
784 }
785
785 }
786
786 }
787
787 }
788
788 }
789
789 }
790
790 }
791
791 }
792
792 }
793
793 }
794
794 }
795
795 }
796
796 }
797
797 }
798
798 }
799
799 }
800
800 }
801
801 }
802
802 }
803
803 }
804
804 }
805
805 }
806
806 }
807
807 }
808
808 }
809
809 }
810
810 }
811
811 }
812
812 }
813
813 }
814
814 }
815
815 }
816
816 }
817
817 }
818
818 }
819
819 }
820
820 }
821
821 }
822
822 }
823
823 }
824
824 }
825
825 }
826
826 }
827
827 }
828
828 }
829
829 }
830
830 }
831
831 }
832
832 }
833
833 }
834
834 }
835
835 }
836
836 }
837
837 }
838
838 }
839
839 }
840
840 }
841
841 }
842
842 }
843
843 }
844
844 }
845
845 }
846
846 }
847
847 }
848
848 }
849
849 }
850
850 }
851
851 }
852
852 }
853
853 }
854
854 }
855
855 }
856
856 }
857
857 }
858
858 }
859
859 }
860
860 }
861
861 }
862
862 }
863
863 }
864
864 }
865
865 }
866
866 }
867
867 }
868
868 }
869
869 }
870
870 }
871
871 }
872
872 }
873
873 }
874
874 }
875
875 }
876
876 }
877
877 }
878
878 }
879
879 }
880
880 }
881
881 }
882
882 }
883
883 }
884
884 }
885
885 }
886
886 }
887
887 }
888
888 }
889
889 }
890
890 }
891
891 }
892
892 }
893
893 }
894
894 }
895
895 }
896
896 }
897
897 }
898
898 }
899
899 }
900
900 }
901
901 }
902
902 }
903
903 }
904
904 }
905
905 }
906
906 }
907
907 }
908
908 }
909
909 }
910
910 }
911
911 }
912
912 }
913
913 }
914
914 }
915
915 }
916
916 }
917
917 }
918
918 }
919
919 }
920
920 }
921
921 }
922
922 }
923
923 }
924
924 }
925
925 }
926
926 }
927
927 }
928
928 }
929
929 }
930
930 }
931
931 }
932
932 }
933
933 }
934
934 }
935
935 }
936
936 }
937
937 }
938
938 }
939
939 }
940
940 }
941
941 }
942
942 }
943
943 }
944
944 }
945
945 }
946
946 }
947
947 }
948
948 }
949
949 }
950
950 }
951
951 }
952
952 }
953
953 }
954
954 }
955
955 }
956
956 }
957
957 }
958
958 }
959
959 }
960
960 }
961
961 }
962
962 }
963
963 }
964
964 }
965
965 }
966
966 }
967
967 }
968
968 }
969
969 }
970
970 }
971
971 }
972
972 }
973
973 }
974
974 }
975
975 }
976
976 }
977
977 }
978
978 }
979
979 }
980
980 }
981
981 }
982
982 }
983
983 }
984
984 }
985
985 }
986
986 }
987
987 }
988
988 }
989
989 }
990
990 }
991
991 }
992
992 }
993
993 }
994
994 }
995
995 }
996
996 }
997
997 }
998
998 }
999
999 }
1000
1000 }
1001
1001 }
1002
1002 }
1003
1003 }
1004
1004 }
1005
1005 }
1006
1006 }
1007
1007 }
1008
1008 }
1009
1009 }
1010
1010 }
1011
1011 }
1012
1012 }
1013
1013 }
1014
1014 }
1015
1015 }
1016
1016 }
1017
1017 }
1018
1018 }
1019
1019 }
1020
1020 }
1021
1021 }
1022
1022 }
1023
1023 }
1024
1024 }
1025
1025 }
1026
1026 }
1027
1027 }
1028
1028 }
1029
1029 }
1030
1030 }
1031
1031 }
1032
1032 }
1033
1033 }
1034
1034 }
1035
1035 }
1036
1036 }
1037
1037 }
1038
1038 }
1039
1039 }
1040
1040 }
1041
1041 }
1042
1042 }
1043
1043 }
1044
1044 }
1045
1045 }
1046
1046 }
1047
1047 }
1048
1048 }
1049
1049 }
1050
1050 }
1051
1051 }
1052
1052 }
1053
1053 }
1054
1054 }
1055
1055 }
1056
1056 }
1057
1057 }
1058
1058 }
1059
1059 }
1060
1060 }
1061
1061 }
1062
1062 }
1063
1063 }
1064
1064 }
1065
1065 }
1066
1066 }
1067
1067 }
1068
1068 }
1069
1069 }
1070
1070 }
1071
1071 }
1072
1072 }
1073
1073 }
1074
1074 }
1075
1075 }
1076
1076 }
1077
1077 }
1078
1078 }
1079
1079 }
1080
1080 }
1081
1081 }
1082
1082 }
1083
1083 }
1084
1084 }
1085
1085 }
1086
1086 }
1087
1087 }
1088
1088 }
1089
1089 }
1090
1090 }
1091
1091 }
1092
1092 }
1093
1093 }
1094
1094 }
1095
1095 }
1096
1096 }
1097
1097 }
1098
1098 }
1099
1099 }
1100
1100 }
1101
1101 }
1102
1102 }
1103
1103 }
1104
1104 }
1105
1105 }
1106
1106 }
1107
1107 }
1108
1108 }
1109
1109 }
1110
1110 }
1111
1111 }
1112
1112 }
1113
1113 }
1114
1114 }
1115
1115 }
1116
1116 }
1117
1117 }
1118
1118 }
1119
1119 }
1120
1120 }
1121
1121 }
1122
1122 }
1123
1123 }
1124
1124 }
1125
1125 }
1126
1126 }
1127
1127 }
1128
1128 }
1129
1129 }
1130
1130 }
1131
1131 }
1132
1132 }
1133
1133 }
1134
1134 }
1135
1135 }
1136
1136 }
1137
1137 }
1138
1138 }
1139
1139 }
1140
1140 }
1141
1141 }
1142
1142 }
1143
1143 }
1144
1144 }
1145
1145 }
1146
1146 }
1147
1147 }
1148
1148 }
1149
1149 }
1150
1150 }
1151
1151 }
1152
1152 }
1153
1153 }
1154
1154 }
1155
1155 }
1156
1156 }
1157
1157 }
1158
1158 }
1159
1159 }
1160
1160 }
1161
1161 }
1162
1162 }
1163
1163 }
1164
1164 }
1165
1165 }
1166
1166 }
1167
1167 }
1168
1168 }
1169
1169 }
1170
1170 }
1171
1171 }
1172
1172 }
1173
1173 }
1174
1174 }
1175
1175 }
1176
1176 }
1177
1177 }
1178
1178 }
1179
1179 }
1180
1180 }
1181
1181 }
1182
1182 }
1183
1183 }
1184
1184 }
1185
1185 }
1186
1186 }
1187
1187 }
1188
1188 }
1189
1189 }
1190
1190 }
1191
1191 }
1192
1192 }
1193
1193 }
1194
1194 }
1195
1195 }
1196
1196 }
1197
1197 }
1198
1198 }
1199
1199 }
1200
1200 }
1201
1201 }
1202
1202 }
1203
1203 }
1204
1204 }
1205
1205 }
1206
1206 }
1207
1207 }
1208
1208 }
1209
1209 }
1210
1210 }
1211
1211 }
1212
1212 }
1213
1213 }
1214
1214 }
1215
1215 }
1216
1216 }
1217
1217 }
1218
1218 }
1219
1219 }
1220
1220 }
1221
1221 }
1222
1222 }
1223
1223 }
1224
1224 }
1225
1225 }
1226
1226 }
1227
1227 }
1228
1228 }
1229
1229 }
1230
1230 }
1231
1231 }
1232
1232 }
1233
1233 }
1234
1234 }
1235
1235 }
1236
1236 }
1237
1237 }
1238
1238 }
1239
1239 }
1240
1240 }
1241
1241 }
1242
1242 }
1243
1243 }
1244
1244 }
1245
1245 }
1246
1246 }
1247
1247 }
1248
1248 }
1249
1249 }
1250
1250 }
1251
1251 }
1252
1252 }
1253
1253 }
1254
1254 }
1255
1255 }
1256
1256 }
1257
1257 }
1258
1258 }
1259
1259 }
1260
1260 }
1261
1261 }
1262
1262 }
1263
1263 }
1264
1264 }
1265
1265 }
1266
1266 }
1267
1267 }
1268
1268 }
1269
1269 }
1270
1270 }
1271
1271 }
1272
1272 }
1273
1273 }
1274
1274 }
1275
1275 }
1276
1276 }
1277
1277 }
1278
1278 }
1279
1279 }
1280
1280 }
1281
1281 }
1282
1282 }
1283
1283 }
1284
1284 }
1285
1285 }
1286
1286 }
1287
1287 }
1288
1288 }
1289
1289 }
1290
1290 }
1291
1291 }
1292
1292 }
1293
1293 }
1294
1294 }
1295
1295 }
1296
1296 }
1297
1297 }
1298
1298 }
1299
1299 }
1300
1300 }
1301
1301 }
1302
1302 }
1303
1303 }
1304
1304 }
1305
1305 }
1306
1306 }
1307
1307 }
1308
1308 }
1309
1309 }
1310
1310 }
1311
1311 }
1312
1312 }
1313
1313 }
1314
1314 }
1315
1315 }
1316
1316 }
1317
1317 }
1318
1318 }
1319
1319 }
1320
1320 }
1321
1321 }
1322
1322 }
1323
1323 }
1324
1324 }
1325
1325 }
1326
1326 }
1327
1327 }
1328
1328 }
1329
1329 }
1330
1330 }
1331
1331 }
1332
1332 }
1333
1333 }
1334
1334 }
1335
1335 }
1336
1336 }
1337
1337 }
1338
1338 }
1339
1339 }
1340
1340 }
1341
1341 }
1342
1342 }
1343
1343 }
1344
1344 }
1345
1345 }
1346
1346 }
1347
1347 }
1348
1348 }
1349
1349 }
1350
1350 }
1351
1351 }
1352
1352 }
1353
1353 }
1354
1354 }
1355
1355 }
1356
1356 }
1357
1357 }
1358
1358 }
1359
1359 }
1360
1360 }
1361
1361 }
1362
1362 }
1363
1363 }
1364
1364 }
1365
1365 }
1366
1366 }
1367
1367 }
1368
1368 }
1369
1369 }
1370
1370 }
1371
1371 }
1372
1372 }
1373
1373 }
1374
1374 }
1375
1375 }
1376
1376 }
1377
1377 }
1378
1378 }
1379
1379 }
1380
1380 }
1381
1381 }
1382
1382 }
1383
1383 }
1384
1384 }
1385
1385 }
1386
1386 }
1387
1387 }
1388
1388 }
1389
1389 }
1390
1390 }
1391
1391 }
1392
1392 }
1393
1393 }
1394
1394 }
1395
1395 }
1396
1396 }
1397
1397 }
1398
1398 }
1399
1399 }
1400
1400 }
1401
1401 }
1402
1402 }
1403
1403 }
1404
1404 }
1405
1405 }
1406
1406 }
1407
1407 }
1408
1408 }
1409
1409 }
1410
1410 }
1411
1411 }
1412
1412 }
1413
1413 }
1414
1414 }
1415
1415 }
1416
1416 }
1417
1417 }
1418
1418 }
1419
1419 }
1420
1420 }
1421
1421 }
1422
1422 }
1423
1423 }
1424
1424 }
1425
1425 }
1426
1426 }
1427
1427 }
1428
1428 }
1429
1429 }
1430
1430 }
1431
1431 }
1432
1432 }
1433
1433 }
1434
1434 }
1435
1435 }
1436
1436 }
1437
1437 }
1438
1438 }
1439
1439 }
1440
1440 }
1441
1441 }
1442
1442 }
1443
1443 }
1444
1444 }
1445
1445 }
1446
1446 }
1447
1447 }
1448
1448 }
1449
1449 }
1450
1450 }
1451
1451 }
1452
1452 }
1453
1453 }
1454
1454 }
1455
1455 }
1456
1456 }
1457
1457 }

```

```

98     private void startNetworkTraffic(String runRouteRecord) {
99         JsonObjectRequest networkRequest = new JsonObjectRequest(Request.Method.GET,
100             url: targetURL + runRouteRecord, jsonRequest: null, new Response.Listener<JSONObject>() {
101                 @Override
102                 public void onResponse(JSONObject response) {
103                     ...
104                 }, new Response.ErrorListener() {
105                     @Override
106                     public void onErrorResponse(VolleyError error) {
107                         ...
108                     });
109                     mRequestQueue.add(networkRequest);
110                 }
111             }
112             NetworkAnnotation annotation is required. more... (#F1)
113         }
114     }
115 }
```

A screenshot of an Android Studio code editor. The code is part of a Java file. A yellow arrow points from the text "mRequestQueue.add(networkRequest);" to a tooltip at the bottom of the screen that says "NetworkAnnotation annotation is required. more... (#F1)". The code itself shows a method named "startNetworkTraffic" that creates a "JsonObjectRequest" object and adds it to a "mRequestQueue". The "mRequestQueue" variable is highlighted in pink.

- (a) When network traffic is detected, the plugin requires a ‘NetworkAnnotation’ attached to the target network request data.

```

99     private void startNetworkTraffic(String runRouteRecord) {
100         @LocationAnnotation(
101             purpose = {LocationPurpose.map_and_navigation},
102             purposeDescription = {"Track the route"},
103             dataType = {LocationDataType.FINE_GRAINED_LATITUDE_LONGITUDE},
104             visibility = {Visibility.WHILE_IN_USE},
105             frequency = {"The location will be updated as fast as possible"})
106         @NetworkAnnotation(
107             purposeDescription = {"For trace data backup"},
108             destination = {targetURL},
109             encryptedInTransmission = {true},
110             retentionTime = {"indefinitely unless the user requests to delete"})
111         JsonObjectRequest networkRequest = new JsonObjectRequest(Request.Method.GET,
112             url: targetURL + runRouteRecord, jsonRequest: null, new Response.Listener<JSONObject>() {
113                 @Override
114                 public void onResponse(JSONObject response) {
115                     ...
116                 }, new Response.ErrorListener() {
117                     @Override
118                     public void onErrorResponse(VolleyError error) {
119                         ...
120                     });
121                     mRequestQueue.add(networkRequest);
122                 }
123             }
124         }
125     }
126 }
```

A screenshot of an Android Studio code editor showing the same Java file as above, but with additional annotations added. Two orange arrows point to the "@LocationAnnotation" and "@NetworkAnnotation" annotations. The "@LocationAnnotation" annotation specifies purposes like "map_and_navigation" and "Track the route". The "@NetworkAnnotation" annotation specifies purposes like "For trace data backup" and includes details about destination, encryption, and retention time. The code remains largely the same as in figure 4.3a, with the addition of these annotations.

- (b) After completing all required annotations. NetworkAnnotation describes how the data is transmitted, other personal data annotation describes what data will leave the phone at this point.

Figure 4.3: Building a run tracking and mapping app with Coconut: When sending the routes to the remote server, a ‘@NetworkAnnotation’ annotation is needed to describe how the data is transmitted out of the phone, along with other annotations (e.g. the ‘@LocationAnnotation’) that describe what data may leave the phone at this point and what purposes are.

to describe how the data is transmitted from the phone, along with other annotations (the ‘@LocationAnnotation’) that describe what personal data may leave the phone and for what purposes (see Figure 4.3). Ann starts to construct a network request to send the routes aggregated from the location data to the remote server. Similar to the location API in the previous example, Coconut detects the network connection, and requires developers to add a ‘@NetworkAnnotation’ that describes how data is transmitted out of the phone (Figure 4.3a). In addition, Coconut also requires Ann to annotate what data may leave the phone at this point. Since this request contains location gathered previously, Ann just reuses the prior annotation. The final result is presented in Figure 4.3b.

When writing the privacy policy for this app, Ann reviews personal data practices using the PrivacyChecker window (see Figure 4.4). One month later, Ann finishes the app and plans to release it on the app store. The app store requires her to provide a privacy policy for her app. She starts looking at other apps’ privacy policies and tries to adapt them to her app’s practices.




Figure 4.4: The developer can examine the global personal data practices using the Privacy-Checker window. Personal data practices are categorized by data type and whether it leaves the internal runtime environment. All cells that display data use instances are clickable and can help the developer navigate to the corresponding code snippet when they click on it.

During this process, she uses the PrivacyChecker tool window, which is a feature of Coconut that gathers all data practices from the annotations. By referring to the annotations, Ann can precisely describe how personal data is used for the current version of the app, including how the location data is collected for tracking running routes and how data is sent over the network for backup purposes.

4.2.2 Designing Coconut to Promote Privacy-Preserving Personal Data Use

Above, I described how an Android developer can use Coconut across the entire development process to gain a better understanding of app behavior, learn about potential privacy issues and better choices, and manage data practices. Next, I detail the design of the main features and explain the underlying design rationale.

Coconut Requires the Developer to Annotate Personal Data Practices in a Pre-Defined Format.

Privacy annotation is a key feature of Coconut (e.g. the ‘@LocationAnnotation’ and ‘@NetworkAnnotation’ in Figure 4.3b). To implement this concept, I use Java Annotations¹, a form of syntactic metadata in Java. Coconut has two major kinds of annotations, namely ‘source annotations’ like ‘@LocationAnnotation’, and ‘sink annotations’ like ‘@NetworkAnnotation’. Using these two types of annotation, developers can track how personal data flows within an app. More specifically, the source annotation specifies where the personal data is acquired, and the sink annotation specifies where it leaves the app. Since developers are likely to have an incomplete understanding of privacy as discussed in Section ??, I draw on previous research in data privacy modeling [73, 77] to design the fields for each type of annotation, so that they cover important aspects of data privacy that are supposed to be described in the privacy policy. Coconut runs code inspection continuously in the background. If a relevant API call is detected and the corresponding annotation is missing, it is treated as a “missing-annotation error”, and the API name will be marked with the same indicator of compile error in Android Studio (i.e. a red squiggly underline) to inform developers that this is a required task.

¹<https://docs.oracle.com/javase/tutorial/java/annotations/>

Coconut Helps Generate Annotations and Checks the Consistency Between Annotation and Code Using Code Analysis.

```

141     @UniqueIdentifierAnnotation(
142         purpose = {UIDPurpose.tracking_user_data_collected_from_multiple_apps_on_this_device},
143         purposeDescription = {"Google may use the advertising ID from the device on which the . .
144             uidType = {UIDType.ADVERTISING_ID},
145             scope = {UIDScope.PER_DEVICE},
146             resetability = {UIDResetability.USER_RESETTABLE_IN_SYSTEM_SETTINGS})
147     AdRequest adRequest = new AdRequest.Builder().build();
148     mAdView.loadAd(adRequest);

```

Figure 4.5: The entire @UniqueIdentifierAnnotation is automatically generated because Coconut is pre-programmed with the implicit data collection behavior of Google AdMob library.

To reduce cognitive load when annotating personal data practices, and to mitigate errors in annotation due to carelessness or misconception of how the API works, Coconut analyzes the code and infers the value of certain fields of an annotation or even the entire annotation. For example, the ‘datatype’ field in Figure 4.2b and the entire ‘@UniqueIdentifier’ annotation in Figure 4.5 are automatically generated. In addition, Coconut also automatically locates the object that contains the personal data which the annotation should be attached to.

Additionally, if there is a discrepancy between the value of these fields in the annotation and the behavior of the code, Coconut will report an “annotation-code inconsistency warning” and highlight the corresponding field name in red. I use a different color than normal warnings in Android Studio and other types of warnings in Coconut, so that developers can establish a mapping in their mental model between the color and the type of issue. This feature helps developers stick to the most updated and accurate understanding of their apps’ behavior.

Coconut Provides Real-Time Feedback on Potential Privacy Issues.

Coconut offers a “privacy-concern warning” when any potential violation of privacy principles is detected (e.g. network traffic not encrypted; using hardware identifier when not necessary; collecting user data for purposes that may not be clear to users), or when the developer may not know that there exists less privacy-invasive approaches to achieve similar goals (e.g. changing parameters to get coarse-grained data when high accuracy is not needed; using APIs designed for privacy [92]). The corresponding field value is highlighted in purple to notify the developer.

To address the issue of developers not being able to balance the trade-off between privacy and other factors, Coconut provides developers with alternative recommendations in the tooltips. If possible, I also provide quickfixes that can directly apply the recommended change in the code. As a result, developers’ awareness of alternatives increases, so that they can make more informed design decisions. The quickfix feature may also lower the threshold for adopting recommended practices.

Coconut Gathers Personal Data Practices in One Place to Facilitate Review.

Coconut offers *PrivacyChecker*, a tool window that gathers all the personal data practices described by the annotations. It displays the data used internally and the data that may leave the

the internal runtime environment in separate panels, and categorizes them by personal data types (See Figure 4.4).

The content in the panel is constructed dynamically, so the developer will always have a clear understanding in the personal data practices of a certain version. Developers can also review what privacy issues still exist based on unresolved Coconut “privacy-concern warnings”

4.2.3 Implementation

I built a proof-of-concept prototype of Coconut, which consists of two parts: *an Android Studio plugin* and a *privacy annotation support library*. The plugin was developed using the IntelliJ Platform SDK². I use this SDK to monitor API usage by capturing file changes in the IDE in real-time, to inform developers of privacy errors and warnings by registering errors/warnings using code inspection APIs, to generate pre-filled annotation skeleton and fix privacy issues by manipulating the code via the syntax tree, and to present the personal data use in the app in a tool window. The version for my lab study comprises 7770 lines of Java code, most of which is used for establishing the basic framework and handling the user interface.

The current implementation supports analyzing a selected group of system APIs and third-party libraries that use personal data. The scope was determined with the goal of providing sufficient flexibility in the programming tasks of my lab study (described in Section 4.3.2). Given the current framework, this list can be easily extended. Recent research has demonstrated the long-tail distribution in the usage of third-party libraries [38], which suggests that it is feasible to cover a wide range of personal data collection behaviors caused by third party libraries. There are always-running threads that monitor the use of these APIs. When a target API is detected, the system will infer the target location of annotations for this API, check if all required annotations are provided, valid, and consistent with the actual code behavior, and also check for other potential privacy issues. The privacy errors and warnings and the automatic quickfixes provided by Coconut are presented in Table 4.1.

Privacy annotations are customized Java annotations, which need to be predefined in Coconut’s privacy annotation support library. The *source* and *sink* annotation annotate the code when the data is acquired and when it leaves the app. The *third-party lib* annotation is used to specify some configurations not defined in the code. For example, AdMob offers developers a web-based management system to specify whether the location-based advertising service is enabled. And I request the developer to also specify the same thing in the annotation so that Coconut can correctly infer the code behavior.

4.2.4 Pilot Study and Feedback

During the development process of Coconut, I solicited early feedback from six developers to improve usability. I accepted suggestions that I felt were feasible for the first prototype of Coconut. For example, I observed that developers tended to quickly test how to use new APIs. However, an error that prevents compilation (e.g. a missing or incomplete annotation) made it harder to just try out an API. Consequently, I updated Coconut to let developers temporarily ignore annotation

²<https://www.jetbrains.org/intellij/sdk/docs/welcome.html>

compile errors. However, missing annotations still appear as errors, and need to be addressed before building the final app, because I still treat these annotations as a requirement.

4.3 Evaluation Methodology

4.3.1 Participants

To evaluate the usability and effectiveness of Coconut, and to gain a better understanding of how developers handle users' personal data with and without my tool, I conducted a series of in-lab studies with 18 participants from March to May 2018. My participants were recruited from two sources. The first source was developers on LinkedIn. I used "Android Developer" as a keyword and set the location filter to my local area to make sure developers can come to my lab to participate in the study. I found 30 qualified candidates in total and then contacted them using LinkedIn InMail. The second source was computer science students at my university. I posted an advertisement in a related Facebook group and email lists, and also put up physical posters for this study in my school. The study was approved by my university's IRB.

Among the 18 participants (14 males, 4 females), 8 self-identified as professional Android developers. All participants were over 18 years old and were familiar with using Android Studio. I used a between-subjects design, with a control group (not using the plugin) and an experimental group (using the plugin). I controlled the number of professional Android developers to be the same in each group. Both groups had an average of 2.5 years of Android development experience. Participants in the experimental group published an average of 2.3 apps on Google Play Store, and the control group 2.2. See Table 4.2 for more information.

4.3.2 Study Task Design

Study participants were asked to complete two programming tasks: a warm-up task and a main task. The warm-up task helped participants get familiar with the programming environment, and also served as a reference of their expertise in developing Android apps that handle personal data. In the warm-up task, developers needed to handle a run-time permission request for location, collect the actual location data, and display the current latitude and longitude on the main UI.

When designing the main task, I focused on three key aspects: the feasibility of finishing it within a limited amount of time, the scope of the privacy principles it can cover, and the ecological validity of the use cases. The high-level goal of the main task was to build a weather app. I drew on a widely-used feature in popular weather apps such as The Weather Channel³ and AccuWeather⁴, which is to provide location-based weather information. Multiple privacy principles should be considered here. First, the granularity of location should be subject to the purpose of getting weather information, which does not need to be very precise (purpose limitation). Second, the app needs to send the location data to a third-party weather provider service to get the weather information, which entails data sharing practices for the core functionality of the

³<https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=com.weather.Weather>

⁴<https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=com.accuweather.android>

app and should be clearly conveyed to the users in advance, to conform to the privacy principles about providing privacy notices, especially for data practices that may be implicit to end users.

In addition to the core functionality, I also included some requirements for monetization and analytics. These are common purposes for using personal data, but fewer end users are aware of them, which may lead to privacy concerns. For app monetization, I asked developers to integrate a banner ad using Google’s AdMob library, which is the most popular advertising library on the market. Prior research has demonstrated that using these libraries can cause severe privacy concerns because they can collect users’ location data in the background when the location permission is granted, which most users and developers are not aware of [28]. For analytics, I asked developers to store the location data locally and assume it would be used for analyzing users’ location history. Since location history can disclose sensitive information about a person, it should be stored securely. I also required developers to collect a unique identifier for the user and to store it with the location data. The selection of a unique identifier affects whether the personal data is properly anonymized, and is also subject to the purpose limitation principle.

For both the warm-up and main task, developers were free to choose any system APIs and parameters to use for collecting location data, generating/acquiring the unique identifier, and storing the data. I provided skeleton code that handled things not related to the focus of this study, such as updating the UI and initiating the network request to the weather web API⁵, to save time and let participants focus on privacy.

4.3.3 Study Procedure

The study lasted for 1.5 to 2 hours. All participants came to my lab. I provided them with a laptop (Mac OS or Windows based on their preferences) and an Android phone for development and testing. Both Android Studio IDE and my Coconut plugin were installed. This study follows a between-subjects design. Both groups did the warm-up task without the plugin enabled, and only the experimental group had the plugin enabled for the plugin training process and the main task. Participants were compensated with a \$75 Amazon gift card.

After introducing the study goals and logistics, both groups started with the warm-up task, which required them to obtain the current latitude-longitude location data and display it on the screen. Both groups had 40 minutes for the warm-up task. The warm-up task was designed to familiarize the participants with the development environment. It is also designed to compare the performance of the two groups when both in the control condition.

Next, the experimenter walked participants in the experimental group through a tutorial of my Coconut plugin, which used the same fictional use case in Section 4.2.1. The experimenter explained the semantics of the source and sink annotations, explained the meaning of each field of the annotations involved in this example, showed how to expand the field definition tooltip by hovering on the field name, and introduced the three types of feedback from Coconut: “missing-annotation error”, “annotation-code inconsistency warning”, and “privacy-concern warning”. The tutorial was always available to the user during the study. This training process was to familiarize them with programming with Coconut, especially the concept of annotations.

Then both groups were asked to complete the main task of building a weather app. Only

⁵api.openweathermap.org

the participants in the experimental group had the plugin enabled. Both groups had one hour to work on the main task. I explicitly asked developers from both groups to imagine they were developing an app that would be used by real users and to take privacy into consideration during the development process.

After finishing all programming tasks, I asked participants to fill out an exit survey that had three sections. The first section asked them to write a privacy policy for the weather app they just built. When writing the privacy policy, both groups could refer to the code they just wrote. The experimental group could also use the PrivacyChecker to review their data practices, as documented in their annotations. The second section had some factual questions about the personal data practices of their app. The experimental group had a third section which solicited feedback about the Coconut plugin.

Finally, the experimenter briefly interviewed the participants, asking about what considerations they had for privacy when developing the app, what they thought about the plugin (only for the experimental group), and the rationale behind some of their behaviors, such as ignoring web resources that contained more privacy-preserving options, ignoring particular privacy errors/warnings or not addressing them properly, and not correctly answering the factual questions in the exit survey. Notes were taken during the process.

The screens of the laptop and the Android phone were videotaped for later analysis, and no audio was recorded. Screen recordings were played back to developers during the exit interviews to help prompt their memories. During the study, developers could use any web resource. However, I required them to only use native APIs or Google Play Service APIs when obtaining personal data due to the scope of APIs currently supported by Coconut.

In the training process, I would answer any question they had regarding the plugin. During the programming tasks, I only answered clarification questions on task requirements, what they could do (such as which part of the code they could change), and what resources they could use. If the participant did not successfully finish the warm-up task within the specified time, I would offer hints on what they were doing wrong (for both groups) afterwards. In this way, I could observe more use of Coconut in the experimental group during the main task when ensuring both groups received the same amount of help.

During each session, one experimenter observed the participant and took notes. These notes include the actions the developer took, the search queries they used, and the thoughts they expressed verbally. After the study, the experimenter reviewed screen recordings to count the time spent on each task and subtask and document some coding and information foraging behaviors.

4.3.4 Privacy Policy Evaluation Methodology

To avoid potential bias, I invited two external judges for evaluating the privacy policies created by participants, as collected from the first section of the survey. One was a Ph.D. student studying usable privacy; the other was a master's student from a privacy engineering program and also had research experience in usable privacy.

I invited the judges to come to my lab for this evaluation session. During the session, all information was presented to the judge in one spreadsheet. Data from the two conditions were aggregated and stripped of any group information. I first introduced to them the expected personal data practices if the entire task was completed, and presented all valid responses of privacy

policies with a description of the actual behavior of each app, since not all developers finished all task requirements. I created two different spreadsheets for these judges. The responses and app behavior description in these two spreadsheets were the same, with the order randomly shuffled to minimize any ordering bias.

I asked the judges to first skim through all of the responses and then came up with a set of criteria for judging these blurbs of privacy policies. I relied on their expertise and did not give detailed instructions on how to judge the quality of privacy policies. Judge 1 referred to the Fair Information Practices⁶ as the main criteria, and also added two more requirements “providing true information” and “avoiding jargon” for evaluating the truthfulness and readability of privacy policies. Judge 2 did not refer to any specific material. He considered requirements including “providing accurate description”, “providing useful information”, “using plain language”, “explaining all data being collected in the app”, “specifying the purpose of using personal data”, “providing users with ways to control data use”, “informing users of data sharing practices”. Overall, their standards for good privacy policies almost overlapped. I asked the judges to assign the rating for each response from 1 to 10, with 1 being the worst quality and 10 the best, based on the rubrics they developed. They were also asked to think aloud and explain the reason for each rating. The experimenter took notes in the meanwhile. The two judges conducted the evaluation separately and independently.

4.3.5 Research Questions

Nudging developers to adopt better privacy practices while programming can be challenging. For example, some developers may habitually ignore and fail to address warnings, and it is unclear whether developers can understand the underlying privacy concerns when filling the annotations. As such, I aimed to examine the overall effectiveness of Coconut using the following research questions:

- RQ1: Can Coconut help developers avoid more privacy violations?
- RQ2: Can Coconut help developers gain a better understanding of their app’s personal data practices (RQ2.1) and write better privacy policies (RQ2.2)?
- RQ3: Do developers consider Coconut as useful and usable?

Previous studies on how developers think about and handle privacy mostly used retrospective inquiries. In contrast, my lab study allowed us to closely observe how developers deal with privacy issues while programming. Thus, I added a fourth research question:

- RQ4: What kind of challenges for privacy do developers face while programming and when they have been primed with the notion of privacy in advance of the main task?

4.4 Results

4.4.1 Results of the Warm-up and Main Task Completion Are Similar Between Two Conditions

I first present the results about task completion and the time spent on each task. Table 4.3 presents an overview of how participants in the control and the experimental group performed in the warm-up task and the main task.

For those who completed the warm-up task, the average time for the control and the experimental group was 27 and 24 minutes respectively. For those who completed the main task, the average time for the control and the experimental group was 41 and 47 minutes respectively. The average time spent on annotations (including completing the annotation, reading the tooltips, attending to and resolving issues specified in the annotation) was 10 minutes. The number of people who completed the main task was the same, while developers in the experimental group spent slightly more time than those in the control group, possibly because of the extra cost of annotation and the time spent on thinking about and dealing with privacy considerations. I will further detail how developers perceive this cost in the following section as well as in the discussion section at the end.

The success rate of the warm-up task was similar across the two groups, which suggest the app development expertise was well balanced. I did not expect the success rate of the warm-up task would be low, since I pre-tested these tasks with a convenience sample of graduate students who had experience with Android programming and mobile privacy. My results suggest that obtaining location data, which includes requesting location permission for the app, selecting the location API to use, and debugging, can be very challenging for average developers. Note that the main task had a higher completion rate, because parts of the main task overlapped with the warm-up task.

4.4.2 Coconut Can Help Developers Write More Privacy-Preserving Code

Overall, the comparison between the two groups shows an improvement for privacy when using Coconut. More developers using Coconut only collected coarse-grained location data for weather information, only shared coarse-grained location data with the AdMob library, used private storage for sensitive personal data, and selected the proper unique identifiers (Table 4.3).

I also examine why some developers using Coconut stayed with less optimal solutions, such as getting fine-grained location data when the purpose did not require this level of accuracy. I observed that some developers tended to ignore warnings. It could be that my choice of using different colors from normal warnings in Android Studio led to developers not recognizing the warning. Participant E4 also mentioned that he did not always trust the auto-generated annotation, and he would like to first manually verify them several times to develop trust. This issue of trust was discussed further as one of the limitations of my methodology in Section 4.5.4.

⁶<https://iapp.org/resources/article/fair-information-practices/>

4.4.3 Coconut Can Help Developers Better Understand an App’s Behavior

Table 4.4 presents the responses to the second section of my post-study survey, which tested developers’ comprehension of their apps’ behaviors. Some questions were not applicable for developers who did not finish all required tasks, so some of the total counts (the denominator in the fraction) was less than nine (size of each group).

For the overall comparison between these two groups, I only calculated descriptive statistics because of the missing values due to the uncompleted tasks. I accumulated the number of all valid answers and correct answers to calculate a overall correct answer rate. The overall rate of correct answers for the experimental group was 88.14%, higher than the control group (66.67%). The habit to ignore warnings and the insufficient trust in the auto-generated content may explain some incorrect answers of developers using Coconut.

I expected developers who finished the weather feature to answer that the data was transmitted to the server that hosts the weather API, and developers who integrated the banner ad to answer that the data was transmitted to Google’s servers. However, most developers in the control group failed to identify these two facts, especially the one for the ad library. The follow-up interviews showed that the auto-generated annotations for this third-party library helped Coconut users learned about this data sharing practice. The interview results also suggested that although developers from both groups would know that the location was sent to a weather website if asked directly about it, it was harder to recall it from memory without the prompt of annotations.

4.4.4 Coconut Can Help Developers Write Better Privacy Policies

I collected 18 privacy policies written for the weather app, and there was one invalid answer from E2, which just contains one vague phrase “highly recommended”. This may be because that person did not know what privacy policy means. In the following result analysis, I discarded this outlier. I calculated an average of the scores from the two judges as the final score for each privacy policy.


The median of the aggregated final scores for the privacy policies of the experimental group and the control group were 5.875 and 2.750 respectively, and the former was significantly higher (Mann-Whitney U Test⁷, $U = 6.0$, $p < .005$). This suggests that using Coconut can help developers write better privacy policies.

Overall, the experimental group’s privacy policies covered more points in the two external judges’ criteria, including “purpose specification”, “statement truthfulness”, “giving opt-out options”, “discussing security protections”, “openness of implicit data practices (such as data storing and data egress)”, and “readability”. Several aspects exhibited the most salient improvement, including “purpose specification”, “statement truthfulness”, and “openness of implicit data practices”.


4.4.5 Coconut Is Perceived as Useful and Usable

Since the requirement of adding annotations can incur more cost to the developers, I specifically asked them to evaluate if they perceived annotations as disruptive and time-consuming. I also

⁷I use Mann-Whitney U Test because the ratings do not follow a normal distribution.



(a) The results of how disruptive and time-consuming developers perceived about the new requirement of adding annotations (Coconut), and some existing requirements in Android Studio, including adding code to check whether corresponding permissions are granted before invoking personal data API (check permission) and adding try-catch blocks (try-catch) on a 7-point likert scale (1 for not disruptive/time-consuming at all, 7 for very disruptive and time-consuming).



(b) Perceived usefulness of Coconut and key features, as well as how much developers are willing to use Coconut, on a 7-point likert scale (1=not useful/willing to use at all, 7=very useful/wiling to use). feature-A: generate pre-filled annotation skeleton; feature-B: navigate between the API call and annotation for the API call; feature-C: change annotation to the speculated value (when an inconsistency is detected); feature-D: change code to privacy-preserving options.

Figure 4.6: Results of the plugin evaluation part of the survey: most developers found Coconut and features of Coconut very useful, and considered the cost of adding annotations as moderate and comparable to existing requirements. The median values of each group of results are marked in the box.

established a baseline by asking them to rate other kinds of coding tasks, such as adding a permission check before using a protected API and adding try-catch blocks to handle exceptions. The results (presented in Figure 4.6a) suggest that developers perceived a moderate cost for adding annotations, which was comparable to the cost of these existing requirements. Besides, they may gradually feel more comfortable with it after using it as part of their regular development process for a while. When asked why they did not consider the annotation to be very disruptive, some participants ascribed that to the quickfix that generates annotation skeletons and the flexibility to defer filling the annotation.

My survey results also suggest that developers considered many features of Coconut to be very useful, and had great interest in using it for their future projects (See Figure 4.6b). Participants explicitly mentioned how they benefited from Coconut in the interviews, including thinking more about privacy and recognizing privacy issues that they were previously unaware of because of the annotations (E1, E4, E5, E6, E7), gaining more knowledge of their app's behavior because of the auto-filled values in an annotation (E2, E3, E6, E7, E8), getting to know more options and making better design decisions due to the real-time feedback (E5, E6, E9), and streamlining the process of reviewing the personal data practices using the PrivacyChecker overview panel (E1, E4, E6, E9).

4.4.6 Challenges to Handling Personal Data Properly Observed While Programming.

My lab study also provided us with an opportunity to observe how developers deal with privacy concerns while programming. I present some new challenges and how Coconut helped address them.

Challenges for Privacy in the Information Foraging Process

Similar to prior work that studied the implications of information sources on code security [16], I also observed challenges for privacy involved in the information foraging process. Developers used a wide range of information resources during the development process, including official tutorials, API documentation, Q&A sites such as Stack Overflow, tutorials from other websites, and code examples on GitHub. Many of the official tutorials were designed to take privacy into consideration. For example, the code example in “Get the last known location”⁸ only requests the ‘ACCESS_COARSE_LOCATION’ permission, so developers might not collect location data too fine-grained for their purposes if they just followed the default option. Similarly, the “Best practices for unique identifier” tutorial⁹ gives an extensive overview of principles and recommendations for specific use cases to choose the proper unique identifier that protects users’ privacy.

However, according to the observed developers’ behavior and the exit interview results, developers did not make proper use of these resources to improve privacy, for four reasons.

First, some developers already had some experience with the APIs and a rough implementation plan. As such, they either searched very specific keywords that did not elicit these resources

⁸<https://developer.android.com/training/location/retrieve-current>

⁹<https://developer.android.com/training/articles/user-data-ids>

in the search result, or directly skipped them because they wanted to just see a code snippet that could refresh their memory of how to use a certain API (C2, C4, E8).

Second, some developers found or had the expectation that there would be too much information in such documentation, and instead favored Q&A sites that had more concrete examples to show “*how this API works in context, more than just API doc that explains what’s the functionality of each API in detail*” (C7).

Third, some official tutorials did not cover all necessary steps, which caused trouble for novice developers. Although 14 participants opened the “Get the last known location” tutorial which recommended developers to use Google Play services location APIs, only 3 of them successfully implemented the required feature with these APIs. Most developers got stuck when setting up the Google Play Services in their project because there were no direct code examples in that tutorial to refer to. As a result, many developers sought other resources for help, and finally switched to using ‘LocationManager’ APIs, which were easier to implement, but had fewer granularity options, and required the developers to manage the low-level location provider specification manually.

Fourth, developers did not always fully grasp the recommendations and the rationale behind them. E3 admitted that although he saw the principle “Avoid using hardware identifiers” in the “Best practices for unique identifiers” guidelines, he did not pay much attention to it because he was lazy. Furthermore, I frequently observed during the coding process (and confirmed in the interview) that developers tended to directly jump to code examples or keywords related to code. For example, the same “Best practices for unique identifiers” document directly caused C6 to search how to acquire Android ID when it actually opposed using Android ID for his case, because he immediately noticed the keyword SSAID (Android ID) without paying attention to the context where the keyword appeared. The results further motivated the need for a tool that could actively check with the developer about their understanding of the behavior of the code and remind them of better options.

The Common Strategy of “Getting the App to Work First” May Get in the Way of Privacy.

When interviewed about the rationale behind the decision-making process, some developers referred to a common theme: “doing things just for getting the app to work first” (C7, E2, E4). Additionally, I frequently saw study participants do fast testing of APIs, which can act in conflict with privacy requirements.

The location collection task was the most complicated one for most developers because it involved a run-time permission request and because there were multiple APIs (e.g. location APIs from ‘LocationManager’, ‘FusedLocationProviderApi’, and ‘FusedLocationProviderClient’) and parameters to choose from. Furthermore, sometimes the sensor data may not be available or might update too slowly. When the app did not work as expected, developers with little experience in these APIs tended to try out each solution they found online or simply tweaked some parameters in the API call until it worked. Meanwhile, some decisions that may be less privacy friendly (such as using fine-grained location) were made because the app happened to work after changing the parameter that determined the granularity, although it was not the right solution (C7).

My plugin can be helpful in mitigating this issue. For example, E8 in the experimental group

also faced the problem of not getting the location update fast enough. The right solution is to change the parameter that controls the minimum update time interval. At first, she changed the parameter that controls the granularity of the location data, and happened to get the app to work temporarily. However, after this change, the parameter ‘`LocationDataType.FINE_GRAINED_LOCATION`’ was highlighted in purple, which indicated a potential privacy concern. Then she kept investigating this problem and finally found the correct solution. This example shows that my annotations and real-time code inspection can help developers stay aware of any new privacy concerns in their code. Even if they decide to not deal with the concerns immediately, the warning can work as a reminder so they will not forget about it and handle it in the future.

4.5 Discussion

4.5.1 The Value of Privacy Annotations

My study results suggest that, although asking developers to do annotations for privacy involves some extra burden, developers do not perceive them as very disruptive or time-consuming, while also appreciating the value it provides. Here I discuss four reasons why these annotations improved privacy.

First, the process of completing the annotation may lead developers to think through the implications of their code on privacy. Although the task switching between normal development work and filling annotations could incur more cost in time and cognitive demands, many developers appreciated it because they think that they would be more willing to make modifications for privacy at the early stage of app development. This also resonates with P5’s example in the problem finding interviews, which demonstrated that considering a security/privacy issue at late stages may cause extra cost that could have been avoided. Besides, the predefined fields of annotations could remind them to think about a wide range of privacy concerns. For example, some developers (E5, E6, E7) mentioned in the interview that the annotation helped them select the appropriate granularity of location based on the purpose. Although they may not have heard about the “purpose limitation” principle, they could still unconsciously apply that in their decision-making process by drawing connections between the purpose and the location granularity specified in the annotation.

Second, the privacy annotation may help developers be more aware of how the app uses personal data. This is not only because developers could reflect on their data practices when filling the fields of the annotation and correct misconceptions when seeing the real-time feedback highlighted on the annotation, but also because the annotation was kept as part of the code and summarized in one place. Many of my participants considered the overview panel to be potentially useful for large-scale project development and maintenance.

Third, developers may learn more options via the annotation and make better trade-off between privacy and other factors such as usability. More privacy-preserving alternatives can be presented in the real-time feedback, quickfixes, and the pre-defined values for some fields (such as the `LocationDataType` that provides several different granularities of location data). As a result, developers will make more informed design decisions and make a better trade-off between privacy and other factors.

Lastly, doing annotation may motivate self-taught developers to learn more about privacy. Many Android developers did not receive formal privacy training, and the situation becomes worse when they do not use tutorials that promote best privacy practices or get a wrong idea from it (discussed in Section 4.4.6). Annotation can be helpful because developers may use the keywords from the tooltips or the auto-generated content to search for related guidance. I observed developers searched the new keywords after attending to the annotation and also revisited a material that was opened but not paid enough attention to before.

I want to note that the current design and implementation may be more useful to developers who worked in small teams and have limited knowledge and bandwidth to deal with privacy requirements. The nudge to better privacy practices may not be as effective for developers who were subject to the decisions of other people in a large team, and I would like to probe into this problem in the corporate and collaborative context in the future.

4.5.2 Design Recommendations for Addressing Annotation Maintenance Issues

Because annotations do not directly affect functional code, it is possible for developers to specify annotations that were not consistent with the actual behavior of the code. In my current implementation, I tried to tackle this problem by inferring some field values using heuristics, continuously checking whether the value specified in the annotation was consistent with the inferred value and providing real-time feedback to developers in the IDE. My study results suggest that this strategy is effective at assisting developers to maintain valid annotations.

However, I identified some other barriers to maintaining accurate annotations. The first was a lack of trust in automatically filled values in the annotation. Besides letting users gradually develop trust over time, I can also consider adopting some approaches studied in other intelligent systems, such as to provide explanations of how the value was speculated, or even just to provide the origin of the speculation [58]. The second barrier was that developers may understand certain terms differently. For example, developers expressed different interpretations of the ‘WHILE_IN_USE’ option for the ‘visibility’ field. Some people considered that if an activity was paused but not destroyed, it should still be in use, while other people thought an activity was only in use if the user interface is active. Both stronger automatic analysis techniques that check and enforce a unified semantic and advanced modeling of developers’ perception of terms that describe the app status could be helpful.

4.5.3 Generalizability of Using Annotations to Enhance Privacy in Other Programming Languages

In this work, I explore and demonstrate the potential of using customized annotation to help developers handle privacy specifically for Android apps written in Java. I also expect this idea to be applicable to other languages, because annotation/attribute is also used in other mainstream programming languages. For example, C# supports adding customizable attributes to various types of programming elements, which was similar to Java’s annotations. As a result, privacy annotations can also be used in C# code by implementing support libraries.

4.5.4 Limitation of the Evaluation Methodology

Acquiring a large sample for lab studies that involve observing programming process has long been recognized as difficult. First, it is often hard to recruit software developers who usually have a much higher income than the study compensation [17]. Second, the length of such studies can be several hours due to the programming task, which can be hard to scale up. In my study, I recruited 18 developers for a between-subject study, which was similar to many prior studies with similar designs [32, 81]. However, the small sample size may still have implications on the confidence to draw conclusions from the study results. Besides, although I have recruited developers with diverse development backgrounds from multiple sources, half of my participants were still college student developers, which may not be representative enough of the entire population of Android developers.

Although I have tried to design tasks that contain realistic use scenarios and explicitly asked both groups to treat it as an app with real users, the lab study method still has its inherent limitations. Because of the constraint on the time to finish the tasks, some of them may start building the app with less careful plans and exhibit more fast prototyping behaviors than usual. Besides, developers in both groups may pay more attention to privacy than usual, because they were primed by the notion of privacy before working on the main task. Regarding the use of Coconut, developers who used this plugin for the study may react more actively and positively towards the plugin's suggestions and warnings. On the other hand, their performance may also be negatively impacted by the unfamiliarity and lack of trust of the tool because of the short-term exposure in the lab session.

Some potential benefits of Coconut need to be examined with a larger and less controlled study. For example, when developers work on a large-scale project, they may find the annotations and the summary panel more useful for maintaining a correct understanding of the apps' behavior; when they are not subject to the study task requirements, the process of doing annotations and the feedback conveyed through the annotations may trigger more radical changes in the design of the app to improve privacy.

4.5.5 Future Work

In the future, I would like to explore using annotations to improve privacy in two directions. The first is to enhance the current tool. For example, I have considered integrating taint analysis or other more sophisticated static analysis techniques to further reduce the burden on developers. The second is to use annotations to benefit end users and auditors. Specifically, I would like to help developers create privacy policies with annotations and design a better privacy notice interface that can be automatically generated based on these annotations.

Table 4.1: Privacy issues that can be detected in the current proof-of-concept prototype for the lab study. These issues are detected by combining the code analysis and the annotations completed by the developer. Automatic quickfixes are also provided for developers, which can be applied with one click.

Severity	Privacy issue	Explanation	How to fix
Error	Missing valid annotation	The required annotation is not attached to the target variable, or when the annotation is not completed with valid values	Coconut can generate pre-filled annotation skeletons
Warning	Inconsistent annotation	The values in the annotation are inconsistent with what is speculated from the code. For example, such a warning will be generated if the user specifies PRIVATE_ACCESS in the Storage annotation while Coconut finds the data is actually stored in the public area by analyzing the API parameters.	Coconut can automatically modify the annotation to match the actual code behavior or automatically modify the API call to adapt to the value specified in the annotation
Warning	Potential violation of purpose limitation	The current data collection does not match the best practice for the purpose specified by the developer. For example, such a warning will be generated if the user collects a hardware ID (e.g. MAC address) for tracking user behavior within the app.	Coconut can automatically modify the code to acquire a UID that fits the purpose specified by the developer best
Warning	Implicit data collection that may not be expected by users	The visibility is specified as IN_BACKGROUND in the corresponding source annotation, or the background data collection is initiated by a third-party library whose behavior is already known	The tooltip of the warning reminds the developer to provide explicit explanation of this data collection behavior in the privacy notice for users.

Table 4.2: Background information of the lab study participants regarding Android development (yrs of exp: how many years of experience do they have in Android development; active?: whether they were actively working on any Android development project as a software developer; pro?: whether they had worked as a professional Android developer; all apps: how many Android apps they had developed; playstore apps: how many apps were published on the Google Play store; made privacy policy?: whether they had the experience in making privacy policies.)

ID	yrs of exp	active?	pro?	all apps	playstore apps	made privacy policy?
C1	4	✓	✓	>5	3	✓
C2	2.5	✓	✓	3	1	
C3	3	✓	✓	3	3	
C4	4			4	2	
C5	2	✓		>5	3	
C6	4		✓	>5	8	
C7	1			3	0	
C8	1	✓		3	0	
C9	1	✓		3	0	
E1	4	✓	✓	>5	4	
E2	1	✓	✓	2	0	
E3	4	✓		>5	12	✓
E4	3	✓	✓	3	1	
E5	1			1	1	
E6	1	✓		3	0	
E7	4			3	0	
E8	2.5		✓	3	1	
E9	2			3	2	

Table 4.3: Overview of lab study results. C1-C9 are the nine participants in the control group, and E1-E9 the experimental group using Coconut. Some developers did not complete all the tasks, denoted ‘–’. Practices better for privacy are in bold. The meaning of each column are as follows. “warm-up”: time spent on warm-up task; “main”: time spent on main weather app; “weather loc.”: granularity of location for weather info (fine-grained: about 10m accuracy, coarse-grained: about 100m); “ad loc.”: granularity of location collected by AdMob library; “storage”: whether data stored locally is only accessible to this app (private) or also other apps (public); “UID”: type of unique identifier in the weather app (GUID is custom globally unique IDs. Google Instance ID and GUID are user-resettable, app-level unique identifiers which are recommended. Android ID and Telephony ID are hardware identifiers in some versions of Android which are more privacy invasive. See more at [49])

ID	warm-up	main	weather loc.	ad loc.	storage	UID
C1	22'34"	32'25"	coarse	fine	private	Google Instance ID
C2	19'54"	38'47"	fine	fine	private	GUID
C3	38'27"	37'30"	fine	fine	public	Android ID
C4	–	53'19"	fine	fine	private	GUID
C5	–	–	coarse	fine	private	–
C6	–	–	fine	fine	–	pseudo UID
C7	–	–	fine	fine	private	Telephony ID
C8	–	–	fine	–	–	–
C9	–	44'19"	fine	fine	–	GUID
E1	15'14"	60'	fine	fine	private	GUID
E2	–	–	coarse	coarse	–	–
E3	22'51"	30'34"	coarse	fine	private	GUID
E4	25'27"	51'14"	fine	fine	private	GUID
E5	–	–	fine	–	–	–
E6	–	–	coarse	–	–	–
E7	17'29"	34'29"	coarse	coarse	private	Google Instance ID
E8	38'58"	58'44"	coarse	coarse	private	GUID
E9	–	–	coarse	coarse	private	–

Table 4.4: Percentage of correct answers to factual questions regarding apps' behavior. For the fraction after the percentage, the denominator indicates the number of people that answered this question, and the numerator indicates the number of people who answered it correctly. The last row ('Total') calculates the percentage by directly accumulating the number of total answers and total correct answers in each group.

	Control	Coconut
What is the granularity of the location data that you collected for getting the local weather info?	66.67% (6/9)	88.89% (8/9)
What is the granularity of the location data that you collected for the analytics purpose and were buffered on the phone?	75.00% (6/8)	100.0% (6/6)
How frequently does the app access location data for getting weather information?	77.78% (7/9)	75.00% (6/8)
How frequently does the app store location data for analytics purposes?	75.00% (6/8)	100.0% (6/6)
Are users able to reset the unique identifier that you choose?	100.0% (7/7)	80.00% (4/5)
What is the scope of use of the unique identifier that you chose?	71.43% (5/7)	100.0% (5/5)
Did you store the location data in a way that is only accessible to your app?	50.00% (3/6)	83.33% (5/6)
Did you store the unique identifier in a way that is only accessible to your app?	83.33% (5/6)	80.00% (4/5)
Where will the location data be transmitted to in the current version of the app? (Please list all places that you can think of)	11.11% (1/9)	88.89% (8/9)
Total	66.67% (46/69)	88.14% (52/59)

Chapter 5

Honeysuckle: Annotation-Guided In-App Privacy Notice Generation

This chapter was adapted from my published paper:

- Li, Tianshi, et al. “Honeysuckle: Annotation-guided code generation of in-app privacy notices.” Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies 5.3 (2021): 1-27.
-

5.1 Overview

Effective privacy notices are essential for helping users make informed privacy decisions. In the context of mobile apps, usable privacy researchers have advocated various in-app privacy notices that are concise, informative, and user-friendly [20, 130]. This body of work, along with increasing consumer concerns about privacy and an encouraging trend in recent privacy laws (e.g., GDPR) and policies (e.g., Google Developer Policies), has led to smartphone operating systems introducing many privacy features such as runtime permissions, background location access alerts, and visible indicators of ongoing audio recording.

However, while system features like these can increase data transparency to some extent, they are often coarse-grained [153] and limited to data types predefined by the operating system [12, 13]. As such, this leaves much of the responsibility of providing effective in-app privacy notices on app developers’ shoulders, which is a difficult task for several reasons. First, it has been repeatedly found that developers tend to focus more on security factors over aspects of privacy such as data transparency [63, 88, 133]. Second, developers’ incomplete understanding of the concept of “privacy” may create inherent barriers to the adoption of techniques like in-app privacy notices. Third, the design and implementation of effective in-app privacy notices can be a challenging task even for developers who care about transparency issues. For instance, devel-




Figure 5.1: Honeysuckle consists of three components: an IDE plugin, a build system plugin, and a privacy notice library. As illustrated by the flowchart, the three components each play a role at the programming time, the compile time, and the execution time of an app’s life cycle to help developers implement in-app privacy notices. The IDE plugin facilitates developers to annotate the code, and the annotation will later be used to generate privacy notice code. The generated code will be inserted into the app during compile time by my build system plugin. Finally, the generated code calls APIs provided by my library to show privacy notices during runtime.

opers do not always know all data practices of their apps, especially when the app behavior gets complicated and involves the use of third-party libraries [28, 139], or when the data practices are not well documented [85]. Fourth, developers have limited knowledge about design choices and best practices for privacy notices, which has led to uninformative or even misleading ones in real-world apps [98, 114]. Lastly, there is little developer support to help developers keep pace with ever-changing legal and policy requirements, and systematically improve their apps’ data transparency [88].

In this paper, I present Honeysuckle, a developer tool consisting of a plugin for the Android Studio IDE, a plugin for the Gradle build system, and a privacy notice library (Figure 5.1). Combined, these components jointly support a new approach of implementing in-app privacy notices, namely *annotation-based generation of privacy notices*. Instead of treating each privacy notice as a separate feature to implement, Honeysuckle only requires developers to (a) use Java’s existing annotation feature to annotate *each data source and sink* with descriptions of data practices, e.g. declaring the purpose of data use; and (b) optionally modify a configuration file to fine-tune the frequency and visibility of the privacy notices. Honeysuckle can then transparently generate code at compile time that links to my privacy notice library, implementing the privacy notice UIs based on these privacy annotations, the configuration file, and code analysis results. Figure 5.2 illustrates how annotations are used to generate privacy notices and demonstrates a list of example privacy notices that can be generated using Honeysuckle.

My novel annotation-based approach is grounded in three key design considerations that can benefit both developers and users. First, it gives developers control over the generated UI to provide context information and configure the behaviors of privacy notices at a relatively fine granularity. Second, it reduces the implementation and maintenance cost of in-app privacy notices by minimizing redundant information and providing alerts for inconsistency. Third, my IDE plugin offers features that can help developers track and annotate all places that collect, store, and transmit sensitive user data (i.e., data sources and sinks), which improves the accuracy and comprehensiveness of information conveyed in the privacy notices. Overall, I believe Honeysuckle demonstrates a viable path forward to reducing the barriers to adopting in-app privacy notices while also improving the consistency of in-app privacy notices across apps by different developers.

To evaluate Honeysuckle, I conducted a within-subjects programming study with 12 Android

developers. During the study, each participant was asked to implement and integrate in-app privacy notices (as demonstrated in Figure 5.2) for two popular open-source apps, a notification manager app with over 1M installs and a note-taking app with over 100K installs. A challenge, however, is that the current state of the art is to build these privacy notices manually, which would not be a good baseline for comparison since it clearly takes a great deal of time and energy to design and implement these notices. That is, I felt that I would not learn much against offering no support. Instead, I decided to compare my annotation-based approach (a relatively unfamiliar approach for participants) against simply using my own privacy notice library. I felt that this approach would be a reasonable approximation of how developers or large organizations might provide reusable privacy notices.

My results show that the annotation-based approach proposed by Honeysuckle significantly reduced the time and the cognitive load of implementing fine-grained, contextualized privacy notices for the two open source apps than using my library directly. Within the 40-minute allocated time, all 12 developers completed all the required privacy notices using the annotation-based approach, while only 2 developers completed the same task using the library. All participants considered the annotation-based approach much easier to use and learn than the library-based approach because the clear step-by-step guidance provided by my Honeysuckle IDE plugin effectively reduced the learning curve, the use of quick-fixes and code generation allowed developers to write much less code, and the use of annotations reduced redundancies and made the code easier to comprehend.

This paper makes the following contributions:

- I present the design and implementation of Honeysuckle, an Android developer tool that offers *annotation-based generation of privacy notices*. Honeysuckle consists of an IDE (Android Studio) plugin, a build system (Gradle) plugin, and a privacy notice library.
- I conducted a controlled, within-subjects programming study to evaluate these two approaches of implementing in-app privacy notices supported by Honeysuckle. My results show that the annotation-based approach helped developers build in-app privacy notices faster with significantly lower cognitive load than manually implementing and integrating them using a library.

5.1.1 Motivating Example: Library vs. Annotation

Below, I offer two scenarios to help convey the intuition of how Honeysuckle’s two approaches for in-app privacy notices work. Bao is an Android developer working on a social media app and has just finished two features using location data. The first feature silently accesses the latest GPS location when the user refreshes the news feed, to optimize the relevance of the results based on the current location (mainly implemented in the function `optimizeLocallyRelevantNews`). The second feature allows users to view their current location in a map and send the location to selected friends.

She aims to implement three types of in-app privacy notices to enhance data transparency, as recommended by the usable privacy literature. First, she wants to show a dialog that explains both purposes before location permission requests are made, to help users make informed decisions [94, 147, 153]. Second, she wants to show just-in-time notifications when the app accesses




Figure 5.2: The top row shows the annotations and UI configuration XML that developers need to add or modify to generate privacy notices. The bottom row shows the five privacy notice features supported by Honeysuckle (“a” through “e”). I use the same number (1 through 5) to indicate which part of the annotation is used to populate which part of the generated UI, and how the configuration XML guides the presentation of the UI. The design of all these features were inspired by proposals from usable privacy research and privacy regulations. These examples demonstrate the breadth of privacy notices that Honeysuckle can generate with *one annotation* for each data source and sink.



Figure 5.3: An illustration of code changes required to implement the same in-app privacy notices for two location features using the library and the annotation-based method. In the code, green highlights indicate lines that were added; red indicates lines that are removed; grey indicates lines that are unchanged. Between the two conditions, the dashed lines connect code that conceptually serves the same goal, and the solid line connects the same code. We can see that using annotations substantially reduces the amount of code that developer needs to write. The annotation-based approach also supports a more uniform format while the library-based approach requires developers to handle low-level implementation tasks using different APIs and declare data practices in a different place from the actual sources and sinks (outside the control logic).

location data to notify users about the data collection behavior and the corresponding purpose [130]. Lastly, she wants to implement a privacy notice center to provide an overview of all data practices and the purposes of this app, and allow users to configure the notice visibility and frequency based on their preferences [130]. Figure 5.2 shows the reference designs of these privacy notices.

One straightforward way to implement in-app privacy notices is to treat different types of privacy notices as different features and handle them individually. Hence, in the first scenario, I demonstrate how Bao can implement the three target features using the Honeysuckle library APIs. The “Library” column of Figure 5.3 illustrates the main code changes that Bao needs to make. She needs to manually track code that handles location data collection and location permission requests and modify the code to implement the privacy notices. She needs to declare information about the data practices such as the purpose in a separate file from the actual data source or sink. She also needs to choose the proper APIs for different types of privacy notices (e.g., `HSNotificationUtils.pushPrivacyNotification` and `PermissionNotice.showAllD` in this example), and to integrate the privacy notice center into the app. This entire process involves a lot of manual work. Informally, I observe that while this library approach is feasible, there will be challenges in terms of implementation and maintenance for apps with more data practices, especially if the types of required privacy notices change [10, 88]. I also re-iterate that currently for Android, there is no support for building these kinds of privacy notices.

The second scenario demonstrates an alternative approach, namely shifting from “implementing the features” to “declaring the data practices”. This time Bao only needs to declare the data practices by adding annotations to code that handles the collection of location data in different contexts and manually integrate the privacy center so she can decide where to embed it. Honeysuckle can then automatically generate other code for in-app privacy notices (which still uses my library under the hood) and insert it at the right place in the source code. This method is a variation of the classic idea of “model-based user interface design” [108], which aimed to reduce developers’ workload by having them focus on *what* rather than *how*. In addition, my Honeysuckle IDE plugin runs an always-on code analysis to detect code signatures of APIs that may be related to the collection, storage, and transmission of sensitive user data, so as to prompt developers to add these annotations in real time and provide quick-fixes to streamline the task. This can further reduce the burden of manually tracking all data practices and may improve the coverage and accuracy of the in-app privacy notices accordingly.

5.1.2 Background: Why Developers Can’t Implement In-App Privacy Notices Right?

Currently, developers are responsible for implementing in-app privacy notices with proper content, in proper formats, and with proper timing. However, prior research has found that developers often lack awareness, knowledge, and motivation to comply with privacy requirements [63, 85, 88, 133], which leads to several challenges to the adoption of in-app privacy notices.

The first challenge is developers’ lack of awareness and knowledge regarding the importance of data transparency and how to use in-app privacy notices to improve transparency. Sheth et al. [133] conducted an online survey with developers and found that they preferred technical

measures like data anonymization to mitigate privacy risks, perceiving privacy policies as less effective. Li et al. [85] interviewed Android developers and found most of them do not know the best privacy practices listed in the official Android documentation. Liu et al. [98] analyzed the custom rationale messages of permission requests in Android apps and found that a large portion of these messages merely paraphrased the permission request, which corroborated the findings of the interview study. Altogether, these findings suggest that many developers may not have enough awareness of the benefits of in-app privacy notices nor knowledge of how to design them.

The second challenge is in having a comprehensive and precise understanding of data practices across the entire app. Schaub et al. [130] clearly indicated that the first step in designing effective privacy notices is to thoroughly understand the data practices of the app. However, this goal can be hard for developers, even for apps that they participated in developing. One reason is that implementation details are not documented on time [85, 97]. Another is that developers are not always aware of the behaviors of third-party libraries, which might automatically collect user data [28, 139]. Overall, not addressing these issues may result in uninformative or even misleading privacy notices that are harmful to users' privacy.

The third challenge is that implementing in-app privacy notices increases implementation and maintenance costs. Although the design of in-app privacy notices has been studied a lot, there is little research in the implementation of these in-app privacy notices. There are also few developer tools to facilitate implementation, other than libraries that help handle permission requests required by the operating system [11] or comply with recent privacy laws such as requesting for consent before data collection [14]. Furthermore, the currently available developer tools have narrow purposes, such as “providing the consent dialog required by GDPR for the Google Admob library”, which offers little help with maintaining an app if there are new privacy laws or app store policies to comply with. In fact, recent research examining an Android developer subreddit found that developers complained about this type of unnecessary cost and had negative attitudes towards complying with privacy requirements [88].

In this work, I present Honeysuckle as a tool to help developers with the design and implementation of in-app privacy notices. The design of Honeysuckle is largely driven by the goal to address the three challenges above. In particular, my annotation-based code generation allows developers who are not experts in privacy to follow best practices in privacy notice design because those best practices are already embodied in the generated interfaces. Honeysuckle also saves on implementation and maintenance work because low-level implementation details are hidden from developers, with some details that can be customized using annotations and a configuration file. Furthermore, my IDE plugin can automatically scan all potential sources and sinks and prompt developers to annotate them to ensure comprehensive coverage in the generated privacy notices.

5.2 Honeysuckle Design and Implementation

To help developers who are not privacy experts implement in-app privacy notices following the best practices, I designed and implemented Honeysuckle. My design is mainly driven by the three goals:

D1 Give developers control over the privacy notice UI.

D2 Reduce the implementation and maintenance cost of privacy notices.

D3 Increase the accuracy and coverage of privacy notices regarding the actual app behavior.

D1 is a basic requirement as developers need to have sufficient flexibility to customize the generated interfaces to tailor to the app behavior. In addition, this design goal is also crucial for leveraging developers' knowledge about their apps to generate in-app privacy notices that can accommodate different users' privacy preferences under different contexts [94]. **D2** is motivated by the implementation and maintenance cost challenge as explained in Section 5.1.2. Since developers usually treat privacy as a secondary concern [26, 85], minimizing the workload of implementing privacy features is an important requirement for voluntary adoption. **D3** is motivated by the challenges of developers lacking awareness and knowledge about privacy and often not having a precise and up-to-date understanding of their own apps' data practices as discussed in Section 5.1.2.

Honeysuckle consists of three components: an Android Studio plugin, a Gradle plugin, and a privacy notice library. Developers can use the Honeysuckle library alone to implement privacy notices in a conventional way, which gives developers control (**D1 ✓**), albeit at the cost of still significant implementation and maintenance effort (**D2 ✗**). Developers may also not be able to keep track of all data practices due to challenges detailed in Section 5.1.2, which can result in inaccurate or incomprehensive privacy notices (**D3 ✗**).

Alternatively, developers can use the entire Honeysuckle system to annotate the code and modify a configuration file to generate code that calls the library to create in-app privacy notices. This method greatly reduces the implementation and maintenance effort (**D2 ✓**) and provides the same control over the generated UI. (**D1 ✓**). Furthermore, my Honeysuckle Android Studio plugin provides features that help increase the accuracy and coverage of data practices declared in the annotations to improve the generated privacy notices (**D3 ✓**).

In the following, I first present the design of the in-app privacy notices supported by Honeysuckle. Then I describe how I designed Honeysuckle to support the two approaches mentioned above to implement these in-app privacy notices. I describe the implementation of the main modules of Honeysuckle at the end.

5.2.1 Privacy Notice Designs and Rationales

I present the design of the in-app privacy notices supported by Honeysuckle and explain their relationship with best practices advocated by prior literature. My design decisions concern two aspects: timing and content.

Timing

According to Schaub et al. [130], the timing of these notices is a key consideration. I designed three types of privacy notices corresponding to three timing options described in that paper: *at setup*, *just in time*, and *on demand*.

T1 *at setup*: A dialog shown before permission requests that proactively explains the purposes of the permission request and the related data egress and retention behavior (Figure 5.2)

(a)).

T2 *just in time*: A just-in-time notification that appears immediately after the data is accessed or sent off the device by the app (Figure 5.2 (b)).

T3 *on demand*: A privacy center that contain a hierarchical overview of all sensitive data practices in this app. Unlike the previous two types, the privacy center shows up on demand, so it can contain more in-depth information about the apps' data practices (Figure 5.2 (c)(e)(f)).

Content

As discussed in Section ??, privacy notices should reduce potential notification fatigue and habituation by highlighting unexpected and sensitive data practices. my design is based on recommendations of prior research, common practices of real-world systems, and requirements of privacy laws. I detail each design and the supporting literature below.

- I1** Data use purpose: Prior research has recommended apps to explicitly explain their purposes of data use to users especially before permission requests to help them make informed decisions and also feel more comfortable with sharing data with the app [94, 147, 153]. These recommendations were later adopted by the Android official documentation about best practices regarding permission requests [47].
- I2** Third-party data use: Research has showed that 3rd-party data use causes most privacy concerns because they are unlikely to be expected by users and are often used for purposes such as targeted advertising that do not provide direct benefits to users [38, 141]. Many privacy laws and app store policies now require developers to explicitly specify data sharing with third parties in privacy policies.
- I3** Data egress and retention: Data egress and retention can both lead to higher secondary data use and data breach risks. Researchers have proposed program analysis techniques to automatically detect [57] and alert users about these sensitive data practices [100].
- I4** Background access: Background data access is likely unexpected by the user, and therefore deserves more explicit alerts [124, 130] For example, both iOS and Android allow users to only grant permission to location collection in foreground. iOS also occasionally alerts users about background location collection.
- I5** Data access frequency and time: Prior research has demonstrated that showing the when and how frequently an app has accessed sensitive data can nudge users to improve their awareness of sensitive data practices and take more action to protect their privacy [20, 27].

5.2.2 Honeysuckle Library-Only Mode

I designed a library for implementing all the proposed features. Figure 5.3 shows an example of how to use the library to implement in-app privacy notices for two location features in a social media app. Developers need to use three different APIs to implement privacy notices shown at different times.

For **T1**, developers need to replace all permission requests with `PermissionNotice.showAllDialog` function calls to show the permission explanation dialog.

For **T2**, developers call the function `HSNotificationUtils.pushPrivacyNotification` after all data sources and sinks to show a just-in-time notification when the data is collected or sent off the device. A string identifier of the current data usage needs to be passed as a parameter to retrieve the purpose of the current data usage and configurations about how to show the privacy notice declared in a separate file (see the `MyPrivacyInfoMap.java` in Figure 5.3 as an example; details will be provided later).

For **T3**, developers call the system API `startActivity` and pass `PrivacyCenterActivity.class` as a parameter to open the privacy center. `PrivacyCenterActivity` is an activity class defined by the Honeysuckle library. It can automatically load data practices declared in the configuration file and populate the privacy center with these data practices at runtime. Note that developers need to manually call this API both when using the library alone and when using annotations to generate privacy notices, because developers should be able to determine where to embed the entry point of the privacy center in their apps.

In addition to the three APIs, developers also need to declare what information will be presented in the privacy notices (based on information types listed in Section 5.2.1) and default configurations about how to show the privacy notices for each source and sink using the `putSourcePrivacyInfo` and `putSinkPrivacyInfo` APIs. Each API call creates and registers an instance in a *global privacy information map* that is used to populate privacy notices at runtime, so the first parameter of the API call needs to be a unique identifier for retrieving the instance. Developers need to pass five parameters to `putSourcePrivacyInfo`: the data type by choosing a predefined option, the purpose of data use, whether the data is used by a third-party library, whether the data will be stored or sent off the device, and whether it is a one-off, periodic, or continuous data collection. For each data sink, developers need to provide all of the parameters above, as well as a list of the identifiers of all the sources of the data flow to the sink, and a string that describes the type of data that will leave the sink node. My Honeysuckle library can automatically determine whether the app collects sensitive data in the background, hence developers do not need to handle this themselves.

Regarding how and which type of privacy notices is shown, developers need to pass two parameters. One is an enum parameter that determines how frequently the just-in-time notification will pop up (e.g., one possible option is `NOTIFICATION_ALWAYS_POP_OUT` as demonstrated in Figure 5.3). The other is a boolean parameter that indicates whether to record the timestamps of a data collection, data retention, or data egress activity and show them in the privacy notice center (see Figure 5.2 (c) (d) and (e)).

5.2.3 Honeysuckle Annotation-Based Code Generation Mode

Although the Honeysuckle library can help generate in-app privacy notices, it comes at a significant development cost due to all the repetitive code that has to be added. For instance, developers need to explicitly specify information already encoded in the source and sink API such as the data type, whether it is a third-party API, and whether it is a one-off or periodic data access. Furthermore, using the Honeysuckle library alone leads to higher maintenance effort since the code that handles privacy UI is scattered across the project. These limitations suggest that the

library approach may not effectively achieve design goal **D2**. In the meanwhile, using the Honeysuckle library alone may also not satisfy the design goal **D3** because developers may not recall all the data practices of their app and not keep up-to-date documentation [28, 85].

To address this problem, I propose *annotation-based code generation*. The key idea is to move from having developers directly implement in-app privacy notices to having them declare relevant privacy-related information using *custom Java annotations and a UI XML configuration*. my *build system plugin* can then automatically generate code that implements in-app privacy notices based on that information at compile time.

To help developers add annotations that cover all sources and sinks and include accurate information (addressing **D3**), I designed the Honeysuckle *IDE plugin* to give developers real-time feedback to help them identify missing annotations or annotations with errors. My IDE plugin also provides several automation features, such as quick-fixes to annotation errors and automatically generating a default UI XML configuration for each source and sink. These features further streamline the actions developers need to do at programming time, thus helping with **D2**.

Annotation and UI XML Configuration

I put the information related to data practices in annotations that are directly embedded in the control logic right next to the corresponding data sources and sinks and put the information about the UI behavior in a separate UI XML configuration file (see examples in Figure 5.2). The annotations and the UI XML configuration together serve the same goal of the privacy information map in the library mode (Section 5.2.2), while the new method leverages the software design principle of separation of concerns to result in code that is easier to read, maintain, and analyze.

Table 5.1: @Source and @Sink annotation definition in Honeysuckle.

Annotation type	Annotation fields
@Source	sourceData (DataType enum value) purposeName (int, String resource ID)
@Sink	sources (@Source list) sinkData (int, String resource ID) purposeName (int, String resource ID)

Table 5.1 demonstrates the definition of the two main annotations: @Source and @Sink. While programming, developers need to annotate the sources and sinks of the sensitive data flows in their app using these two annotations. The two annotations *only* need the purposes of data use and the connection between sources and sinks from developers, because other information in privacy notices can be automatically inferred and inserted into the generated code at compile time.

I design the UI XML configuration to provide developers with some options to control how to show the privacy notices at the granularity of <data type, purpose> pairs. Note that multiple API calls can be used collectively to achieve the same purpose. In my terminology, they are considered as the same sources and sinks.




Figure 5.4: This figure demonstrates the main features of the Honeysuckle IDE plugin via an example use case. First, the app developer opens the Privacy UI Integration panel (A-1) to see what code accesses sensitive user data (i.e., data sources) as detected by the plugin. Then she can use the quick-fix “Add Source annotation” (A-2) to add an annotation for each of these sources and complete required fields in the annotation (e.g., purposeName) (A-3) to resolve the “(incomplete)” errors. Similarly, she needs to annotate “sinks” that may store or send sensitive user data off device (B-4) with the help of quick-fixes (B-5). To indicate how data flows, she also needs to explicitly specify all sources (represented by the source annotations) that may reach this sink (B-6). Lastly, she can modify an XML configuration file automatically generated by the IDE plugin to fine tune the UI behavior (C-7). For example, she can adjust whether to show JIT notification for each source and sink to avoid overwhelming users with unimportant notifications (C-8).

Honeysuckle IDE Plugin

The two main design goals of the IDE plugin are to help improve the accuracy and coverage of annotations and streamline the editing of annotations and the UI XML configuration. To achieve this goal, my IDE plugin provides developers with step-by-step guidance to walk through a usual workflow for implementing in-app privacy notices using the annotation-based approach as demonstrated in Figure 5.4.

This workflow can be roughly divided into three steps (corresponding to A, B, C in Figure 5.4), although there is no strict order restriction. In the first two steps, developers can see all the source and sink API calls that remain to be annotated marked in code and listed in the “Privacy UI Integration” panel (Figure 5.4 (1) and (4)). Then they can use the quick-fixes to add a partially filled @Source (or @Sink) annotation to the source (or sink) code. There are three design considerations for the quick-fixes that I want to highlight. First, for the purposeName field, my quick-fix will generate a “for_” prefix to nudge developers to use expressions like “*for labeling locations in notes*” that provide concrete explanations of the data use purpose rather




Figure 5.5: This figure demonstrates three types of auto-checks that can be conducted by the Honeysuckle IDE plugin. The general design principle is that the IDE plugin only aims to provide timely reminders to developers about annotations and UI configuration entries that may be invalid or outdated, and expects the developers to take the initiative to fix the issue.

than simply paraphrase generic permission requests [98]. This consideration is also explained to developers in error messages for missing annotations. Second, for each sink, I have multiple quick-fixes that each generate a `@Sink` annotation with an existing `@Source` annotation filled in the `sources` field (Table 5.1). I also have quick-fixes to add more `@Source` annotations to `@Sink` annotations. Third, since false positives are inevitable in automatically detected sources [68] and sinks [23], I allow developers to use `NoPersonalDataCollected` to explicitly indicate that sensitive user data is not collected at this point to suppress the alerts. However, there is a risk that developers may provide false information and I discuss potential mitigating approaches in Section 5.4.4.

In the third step, developers can use the “Privacy UI Configuration” panel to examine the current UI XML configuration in the panel or in the original code. To minimize the code that developers need to write, my IDE plugin automatically updates the configuration file if new sources and sinks have been added. Therefore, developers only need to modify this file if they want to change certain options. Furthermore, code auto-completion is provided when developers edit the configuration file (Figure 5.4 (8)).

In addition to the usual workflow, my IDE plugin also runs code inspection continuously to help developers identify and fix invalid or outdated annotations and UI configuration entries (Figure 5.5). To raise developers’ awareness, annotations that contain these errors will be both marked in the code and indicated in the two panels. To achieve a balance between convenience and control, I only show the errors and provide some quick-fixes to help resolve the errors, thus

@NoSpecificUseCase informs the IDE plugin that @Sink will be deferred to where the helper function “writeToFile” is called

```
public static boolean writeToFile(@NonNull File file,
                                 @NoSpecificUseCase CharSequence text) {
    FileOutputStream fos = null;
    OutputStreamWriter osw = null;
    try {
        fos = new FileOutputStream(file);
        osw = new OutputStreamWriter(fos);
        osw.append(text);
        return true; // Navigate to FileUtils.writeToFile(file, log)
    } catch (IOException) { // Navigate to FileUtils.writeToFile(file, sb)
    }
}
```

Privacy UI: Privacy UI Integration Privacy UI Configuration
 Refresh
 Data accessed by the app (Source)
 Data leaving the app (Sink)
 (Incomplete) writeToFile (app/src/main/java/com/achep/acdisplay/services/SensorsDumpService.java:197)
 No specific use case (helper function). Writer.append (app/src/main/java/com/achep/base/utils/FileUtils.java:197)
 (Incomplete) startActivity (send email) (app/src/main/java/com/achep/base/ui/fragments/dialogs/FeedbackDialog.java:369)
 (Incomplete) writeToFile (app/src/main/java/com/achep/base/ui/fragments/dialogs/FeedbackDialog.java:369)

Honeysuckle IDE plugin can guide developers to find the new potential “sinks” using quick-fixes and by refreshing the “Privacy UI integration” task list

```
@Sink()
sources = {@Source(
    sourceData = DataType.SystemLogs,
    purposeName = "For debugging app crash"
),
sinkData = R.string.system_logs,
purposeName = "For debugging app crash"
String log = Logcat.capture();
if (log == null)
    throw new Exception("Failed to capture the logcat.");
boolean success = FileUtils.writeToFile(file, log);
```

```
@Sink()
sources = {@Source(
    sourceData = DataType.MotionSensor,
    purposeName = "For debugging motion_based control"
),
sinkData = "Motion sensor logs",
purposeName = "For debugging motion_based control"
StringBuilder sb = new StringBuilder();
for (Event event : mEventList) {
    sb.append(event.timestamp).append(DIVIDER);
    sb.append(event.sensor).append(DIVIDER);
    for (float f : event.values) sb.append(f).append(DIVIDER);
    sb.append(NEW_LINE);
}
FileUtils.writeToFile(file, sb);
```

Figure 5.6: Annotation and IDE design example: Sometimes an app might have helper functions to collect, store, or transmit data, which leads to a tricky case that one sensitive API call can be used for multiple purposes. In this example, the app creates a helper function “writeToFile” that calls a system API “osw.append(text)” to write data to files. However, because the helper function is called from two different contexts which store different data for different purposes, directly adding a @Sink annotation to the “text” variable is not sufficient for distinguishing between these two contexts when the app is running. Therefore, I propose a new annotation @NoSpecificUseCase to allow developers to provide a cue to Honeysuckle to skip the @Sink requirement for the current level of the function call stack, so developers can annotate @Sink for helper function calls to distinguish data use in different contexts.

relying on developers to take the initiative to make the actual changes.

During the development of Honeysuckle, I observed that some developers may create helper functions that are often called under different contexts for different purposes. In this situation, directly annotating the source or sink in the helper function will have to conflate the different purposes and therefore fail to provide contextualized privacy notices. In the following, I use an example of a `writeToFile` helper function (Figure 5.6) to demonstrate how my Honeysuckle IDE plugin help handle this task using a new annotation: `@NoSpecificUseCase`.

My method is analogous to a Java method throwing an exception and require the caller to handle things. When a developer chooses to use the `@NoSpecificUseCase` annotation to indicate that the original sensitive sink API can be used for multiple purposes in different situations, the IDE expands the sink API list to also include the helper function itself. The IDE plugin then analyzes which parameter of the helper function can reach the initial sink target variable (`text`), and identifies the second parameter as the new target variable of the helper function. Then the developer can either use the quick-fixes to navigate to the helper function calls or refresh the “Privacy UI Integration” to reveal additional tasks due to the addition of the helper function as a new sink. This can be a recursive process in which developers can keep adding

multiple `@NoSpecificUseCase` until a specific use case is available. For `@Source` annotations, the process is similar except that the return value of the helper function will be treated as the new target variable.

Honeysuckle Build System Plugin

As alluded earlier, my build system plugin can generate code for providing in-app privacy notices using the Honeysuckle library based on the annotations, the UI XML configuration, and the code analysis results. A specific design goal of my build system plugin is that when generating the in-app privacy notice code, there should be as little impact on the programming, debugging, and execution of other code as possible. One related design choice is that the mapping between the line number and code should remain the same after modification, so that developers can debug the app with the source code as usual. Towards this end, Honeysuckle appends all the additional code for each source and sink in the same line.

5.2.4 Honeysuckle Implementation




Figure 5.7: Honeysuckle system overview. The three colors correspond to the three component: the IDE plugin, the build system plugin, and the library.

My system consists of three main modules: an IDE plugin (implemented for Android Studio), a build system plugin (implemented for Gradle), and an Android library for creating in-app privacy notices. Figure 5.7 presents four main functionalities of Honeysuckle and I introduce the implementation for each of them below.

IDE Plugin: Code Analysis

The code analysis subsystem of Honeysuckle was built on top of the analysis engine of Coconut [85], which supports real-time API call detection based on method signature matching. I select 568 source APIs and 76 sink APIs using the same criteria as in Coconut and feed their method signatures into the system. Source APIs are defined as APIs that directly trigger sensitive data collection and sink APIs are APIs that store or send data out of the phone. First-party APIs were selected by reviewing the Android documentation and Third-party APIs were selected using stacktraces of third-party libraries collected by Chitkara et al. [38]. Honeysuckle covers 18 sensitive data types, two of which were adapted from Coconut (location and unique id) and the other 16 types were added by us. The sensitive data types are listed in the appendices (Table ??).

To evaluate the code analysis subsystem, I selected 75 open-sourced Android apps on GitHub by searching for recently updated repos (by July 2020) that contain a Google Play link and declare dangerous permissions in the manifest. I cross-checked the API calls detected by Honeysuckle against the API calls detected by doing a method signature search on the Smali code¹ of these apps and obtained the same results. This shows that Honeysuckle can accurately detect all known source and sink APIs. Furthermore, Honeysuckle detected 23 sensitive API calls per app on average (*median* = 12, *std* = 40) and detected at least one sensitive API call for 70 out of the 75 apps. This suggests that although I did not aim to optimize for coverage, Honeysuckle can already detect a sizable number of sensitive API calls so developers do not need to manually keep track of them. I discuss the limitations of Honeysuckle code analysis and potential enhancement in more depth in Section 5.4.3.

IDE Plugin: Support for Adding Annotations and Editing UI Configuration

My IDE plugin runs custom code inspections continuously using the API `BaseJavaLocalInspectionTool` to maintain a record of all the current data practices, annotations, and UI XML configuration. With this information, I implemented the “Privacy UI integration” panel and the “Privacy UI Config” panel using the `ToolWindowFactory` API. The quick-fixes are implemented using the `LocalQuickFix` API. All the above APIs are provided by the IntelliJ Platform SDK.

Regarding the feature to automatically generate UI XML configuration for new sources and sinks, I chose to initiate the modification of the configuration file only after the user clicks the tab to switch to the “Privacy UI Configuration” panel. This method can help avoid generating configuration for intermediate editing results.

Build System Plugin

I chose to develop a plugin for Gradle, which is the most widely used build system for Android development. I implemented custom Gradle tasks and then packaged the tasks into a plugin that can be applied in any Android project by adding one line of code similar to importing a library².

As the app starts compiling, my Gradle plugin will send a compile start signal to a local server run in the IDE plugin so IDE plugin can dump the code analysis results. Then the Gradle plugin inserts privacy notice UI code in the project at proper places based on the sensitive API calls detected by the IDE plugin, the annotations provided by developers for these API calls, and the UI configuration file. After finishing compilation, the source code will be reverted back to the original version that only contains the annotations but not the privacy notice UI code.

Library

The main functionality of my Honeysuckle library is to provide APIs for different types of in-app privacy notices. The permission explanation dialog is implemented using the `AlertDialog`

¹Smali is a human-readable intermediate code format generated by decompiling an apk which expands every API call to its complete method signature.

²Developing Custom Gradle Plugins. https://docs.gradle.org/current/userguide/custom_plugins.html

system API. The just-in-time notification is implemented as an Android notification using the system API. The privacy center is mainly implemented as a Preference UI, which is a common way for Android apps to implement app settings. I used an open-source library MPAndroidChart³ to implement the data access frequency diagram in the privacy center. I also defined my custom Java annotations (e.g., Table 5.1) in the Honeysuckle library.

5.3 HoneySuckle Evaluation: Comparing the Annotation and Library Approach

To evaluate the effectiveness of the two methods supported by Honeysuckle in helping developers implement fine-grained, in-app privacy notices for real-world projects, I conduct a within-subjects programming study with 12 Android developers to examine the following research questions:

- RQ1** What are their effect on developers' time performance in implementing privacy notices?
- RQ2** What are their effect on developers' cognitive load of implementing privacy notices?
- RQ3** What are their effect on developers' perceived usefulness and usability?
- RQ4** How do developers think about the two methods?

5.3.1 Participants

Out of the 12 participants, 11 were freelance Android developers recruited from a freelancing platform (Upwork). The other participant signed up for the study after seeing my recruiting ads posted on Twitter. In a pre-study survey, I asked participants to provide demographic information. 3 participants self-identified as female, and 9 as male. The average age is 31.3 ($std = 9.49, min = 22, max = 56$) years old.

I also requested my participants to provide their background in Android development. My participants reported 4.3 years of Android development experience on average ($std = 1.5, min = 2, max = 7$). 8 of 12 participants self-reported that they have released Android apps on an app store (e.g., Google Play, F-Droid). One participant answered that his most popular app achieved 10M+ installs, another participant 1M+ installs, and a third participant 10K+ installs. All participants considered themselves familiar with Java and Android Studio.

Lastly, I asked them about their prior experience in handling private data and using Java annotations in general. 11 out of 12 self-reported that they have created Android apps that access users' personal data (e.g., geolocation, device ID), with the other participant answering "I'm not sure". However, when choosing from a list of different types of privacy notices, most participants reported only creating privacy policies and requesting system permissions to provide privacy notices. This finding supports my working assumption that developers rarely adopt other types of privacy notices for their apps. Regarding the use of Java annotations, all participants have at least used some simple features such as adding `@SuppressLint` to clear IDE warnings/errors. 3 out of 12 participants reported that they have previously used annotations for code generation.

³<https://github.com/PhilJay/MPAndroidChart>

5.3.2 Control and Test Conditions

The test condition of my study is to use Honeysuckle to modify a real-world app to implement the five types of example privacy notices. The control condition is to use the library I developed for Honeysuckle to generate the example privacy notices introduced in Section 5.2.2. To minimize the carryover effect in within-subjects study design, I chose two popular open-source apps, AcDisplay⁴ (a notification manager app) and OmniNotes⁵ (a note-taking app) and ask each participant to work on different projects using the two methods. Both projects use Java as the main programming language and are of similar complexity. OmniNotes contains around 231 Java files and 21714 lines of Java code; AcDisplay contains around 331 Java files and 59489 lines of Java code. Regarding sensitive data use, OmniNotes contains 10 sources and 2 sinks, and AcDisplay contains 13 sources and 4 sinks.

Note that I chose to use the library as the baseline condition instead of asking developers to achieve the task without any support, because otherwise UI design and implementation issues would clearly dominate the amount of the time on task and it would be unequal comparison with annotations and do not generate insightful results. I searched for Android libraries that support developers to implement these three in-app privacy notices but to no avail, likely because there has yet to be sufficient need to drive the development of such libraries. Hence I asked participants to use the Honeysuckle library in the library condition, which is also what my generated code calls to show the privacy notices, to provide a relatively equal comparison between the two approaches.

I sequentially assigned participants to the following groups based on their signup order:

- 1 modify AcDisplay using annotations + modify OmniNotes using library
- 2 modify OmniNotes using library + modify AcDisplay using annotations
- 3 modify OmniNotes using annotations + modify AcDisplay using library
- 4 modify AcDisplay using library + modify OmniNotes using annotations

5.3.3 Procedure

I conducted my study remotely via Zoom because my participants resided in multiple locations. After the participant signed the consent form, the experimenter turned on screen recording to record the entire session for further analysis. The entire study took around 2.5 hours and mainly consisted of two programming tasks (corresponding to the two conditions). Developers had at most 40 minutes for each programming task, and then spent 5 minutes to fill out a NASA-TLX questionnaire [66] to measure the cognitive load and a Technology Acceptance Model Scale (TAMS) questionnaire [45] to measure the perceived usefulness and usability of my tool. For the two programming tasks, developers modified different apps to implement privacy notices using different methods. Since I wanted to evaluate the programming methods rather than examine developers code comprehension skills, I provided documentation of the apps' data practices containing all the information needed to make the privacy notices so the developer could focus on using the provided tools to achieve the goal.

⁴<https://github.com/AChep/AcDisplay>

⁵<https://github.com/federicoiosue/Omni-Notes>

Before each programming task, the experimenter used a toy app as an example to teach the participant how to use annotations and the library to achieve the task. Specifically, the experimenter first implemented privacy notices for half of the sources and sinks in the toy app, and then asked the participant to complete the rest of privacy notices. During this process, the experimenter answered all the questions the participant had regarding the method of the current condition. For the library condition, I ensured that developers had access to the example app code during the main programming task so they could refer to them when needed.

After completing the two programming tasks and filling out the surveys, the experimenter asked several follow-up questions regarding their thoughts about the two methods, such as which part of the tool was hard to use, what could be improved, and what they thought about the generated privacy notice UIs. Upon completion, each participant was compensated with 75 USD. This study was approved by my university's IRB.

5.3.4 Study Environment

I set up a virtual workstation using a VNC server on a Google Cloud virtual machine, so all participants can work on the programming tasks in this virtual workstation. The experimenter can view and interact with the same interfaces during the study to do live coding during the warm up tasks and to provide guidance to help developers quickly get used to this new environment.

5.3.5 Quantitative Results (RQ1-3)

I present the results to the first three research questions below.

Time on Task (RQ1)

All developers completed the task in the Honeysuckle condition in the allotted time, while only 2 developers (P7 and P9) completed the task when using the library. Furthermore, for these 2 developers, it took them longer time to finish when using the library than using the annotation. P7 used 22 minutes to finished the task using the annotation and 37 minutes using the library. P9 used 14 minutes to finished the task using the annotation and 27 minutes using the library.

Cognitive Load (RQ2)

I analyzed the six dimensions of cognitive load measured by NASA-TLX on a scale of 1 to 100 (lower is better) [66]. Honeysuckle achieved a statistically significant reduction in cognitive load using a paired t-test ($p < .001$, $t=5.09$). Figure 5.8 shows that Honeysuckle helped reduce the cognitive load across all six dimensions, especially for mental load and perceived success.

Usefulness and Usability (RQ3)

I analyzed the perceived usability and usefulness of Honeysuckle and the privacy notice library measured using TAMS on a scale of 1 to 7 (lower is better, 1=extremely likely, 7=extremely




Figure 5.8: NASA-TLX ratings of the Annotation and Library conditions (lower is better). Using the annotation-based approach of Honeysuckle significantly reduces the overall cognitive load as compared to using the library to implement the same runtime privacy notices. The error bars represent the 95% confidence intervals.

unlikely) [45]. I then calculated the sum of all ratings in the usability subscale and the usefulness subscale and compare them between the two conditions. For both usability and usefulness, Honeysuckle received significantly better (lower) ratings under paired t-tests (for usability, $p = .02$, $t=2.76$; for usefulness, $p = .02$, $t=2.67$). The mean usability rating of Honeysuckle is 1.45 and the mean usability rating of the library is 2.56. The mean usefulness rating of Honeysuckle is 1.27 and the mean usefulness rating of the library is 2.30. Overall, developers perceived both tools to be useful and usable, and perceived Honeysuckle to be more useful and usable than the library.

5.3.6 Qualitative Feedback (RQ4)

One researcher transcribed the interviews, conducted thematic analysis following previous guidelines [33], and held regular meetings with other authors to review the analysis process and discuss the findings. The identified themes are categorized as *feedback on programming methods* or *feedback on the generated privacy notices*.

Feedback on Programming Methods

When comparing the two methods, all participants preferred the annotation method a lot than the library method. Without being asked, P2, P7, P10, P11 said they hoped to see a public release of Honeysuckle so they can use it for their own projects. For example, P7 said that “*I hope any of these can be launched. Anyone of them would be cool, but my preference would be the plugin.*” This echos the fact that there is very limited developer support for building in-app privacy notices and suggests both the Honeysuckle library and annotation can improve app’s transparency when also making developer’s life a lot easier. Below, I present themes emerged from participants’ explanations of their preferences.




Figure 5.9: Perceived usability ratings of the annotation-based approach and the library (lower is better, 1=extremely likely, 7=extremely unlikely). Overall, the annotation-based approach was perceived as more usable than the library. The error bars represent the 95% confidence intervals.




Figure 5.10: Perceived usefulness ratings of the annotation-based approach and the library (lower is better, 1=extremely likely, 7=extremely unlikely). Overall, the annotation-based approach was perceived as more useful than the library. The error bars represent the 95% confidence intervals.

Productivity. Six participants (P1, P3, P4, P7, P11, P12) mentioned that they felt a lot more productive when using the annotation method than the library. Specifically, they felt using annotations allowed them to write less code and achieve the task faster. For example, P4 mentioned using annotations could “*avoid a lot of parameters for calling the APIs*”, which is because my annotation design reduces a lot of redundancies by automatically generating multiple types of notices using one annotation. Developers also praised the automated source and sink detection and quick-fixes offered by Honeysuckle IDE plugin. For example, P3 mentioned “*Just being able to go through some automated steps makes it more efficient to add annotations*”.

Mental Load. Nine participants (P1, P2, P4, P7-P12) said that using annotations helped reduce the mental load in many ways. For example, P8 loved the automated suggestions offered by the IDE plugin because “*It simply tells me where I need to add annotations and I don't need to consciously take effort to do that*”. On the contrary, using the library “*felt very tedious*” (P2) and they found it challenging to “*remember what API to use*” (P7). Moreover, using the library requires the developer to “*manually track many things at the same time*”, including naming the sources and remembering the names when defining connections between sources and sinks in the privacy info map (P9). When using annotations, this task is made much easier by the quick-fixes of the IDE plugin.

Learnability and Usability. Nine participants (P2, P4-P7, P9-P12) discussed the learnability and usability of the two methods. Some people found the annotation tool easy to learn. For example, P11 said “*The tool is new to me, but I didn't need to think much to figure out what to do. The plugin has made it very simple.*” Conversely, some participants shared a slightly different feeling that “*the annotations may have slightly steeper learning curve, but after getting the hang of it, using it is way easier*” (P7). The difficulty was mainly in understanding how to specify the source in a sink annotation (P2, P10) and handle helper functions (P2, P5, P10). This result echos the fact that only three out of the twelve participants had used annotations for code generation before the study. However, the unfamiliarity with annotations did not seem to hinder the usage of annotations for privacy notice generation. P4 even said “*Normally I don't like annotations, but for this task I like it. It's very easy to use.*”

Code Comprehension. Four participants (P1, P7, P8, P11) mentioned that using annotations made the code “*organized*” (P1) and “*very easy to read*” (P8). P8 further explained that “*all the configuration goes to the XML, so the annotation only keeps simple information*”.

Teamwork. P4 and P9 explicitly discussed different benefits of using annotations and the IDE plugin for teamwork. P4 liked the quick-fixes for generating annotation templates because it helps everyone in a team code in the same format. P9 was thinking about the situation when developers working in a larger group that have a separate privacy team. He explained that “*The IDE automatically analyzes all the sources and sinks, so the privacy team can focus on the privacy work such as checking if privacy notices have been implemented for all of them.*”

Feedback on the Generated Privacy Notices

When asked about their favorite design among the three privacy notices as a user, eight participants picked the privacy center (P1, P3, P5-P9, P12), three picked the permission notice (P4, P10, P11), and only one picked the just-in-time notification (P2). Participants preferred the privacy center the most because it contained more information about the app’s data practices and it was

available to the user at any time. They also generally found the permission notice and the just-in-time notification useful, for they use a “*streamlined format*” (P2) and provide “*finer-grained detail than what you get with regular permissions*” (P3).

Some people also touched upon potential issues about these privacy notices, categorized into two themes:

Notification Overload Problem. P3 and P5 expressed their concerns about the notification overload problem specifically for the just-in-time notice design. P3 elaborated her concerns using the Starbucks app as an example,

“I use the Starbucks app, and I guarantee you it’ll be blurting at you all the time some privacy notifications, but would that improve my experience? I’m not sure because I kind of know at the back of my head that they’re probably doing that and I guess I’m okay with they know where I am”.

Similarly, P5 said “*receiving many notifications from an app can be annoying from a user perspective*”. I have considered this issue when designing Honeysuckle and allow developers to control default visibility for each just-in-time notification to balance user experience and privacy. However, there are still issues such as developers can only make static decisions so the generated UI can not accommodate to different privacy concerns of different users. In Section 5.4.4, I discuss potential ways to further improve privacy using the annotations.

Factors That Impede Adoption. Some participants also explicitly discussed or implied factors that may prevent them from using Honeysuckle in real life. First, although many participants have been familiar with system permissions, in-app privacy notice was quite a foreign concept to them. For example, P4 was confused when first seeing the permission notice and asked “*Is this extra dialog useful?*” P3 mentioned that she had worked with many clients but had never encountered a requirement of implementing in-app privacy notices. Second, currently Honeysuckle has to rely on developer’s input for some fields in the annotation such as purposes and can not automatically verify them, causing the risk of generating misleading privacy notices if the developer does not provide accurate information. P1 said “*You can not ensure that the developer will be an honest developer and he will tell you his true intentions of the data*”. However, I want to note that this is a general challenge facing any kind of privacy notices. I discuss potential mitigation methods in Section 5.4.4.

5.4 Discussion

I now discuss the benefits of using the Honeysuckle system for annotation-based privacy notice generation, the limitations of Honeysuckle, and other opportunities to improve data transparency and control using annotations.

5.4.1 Annotations as a Bridge to Connect Users and Developers

Previously, Coconut [85] demonstrated that annotations (and other metadata with similar attributes) can help educate developers and nudge them towards adopting best practices for privacy in their apps. In this work, I demonstrate that annotations are also effective in helping developers generate useful and usable privacy notices.

There are many reasons why annotation-based privacy notice generation can address common challenges regarding the implementation of in-app privacy notices. Since annotations are added next to sensitive API calls, developers do not need to explicitly specify any context, which saves on a lot of effort. There is a clear relationship between the annotation and the generated interfaces, which helps with code maintenance and collaboration for teamwork. My IDE plugin can automatically detect data sources and sinks and remind developers to add annotations, which reduces developers' cognitive load and increases the coverage and accuracy of the information declared in annotations. I carefully designed Honeysuckle to handle complicated scenarios in real-world apps, such as having multiple API calls serving the same purpose and having the same API call serving different purposes. More importantly, my approach allows developers to build effective privacy notices without having to be a privacy expert, since the generated interfaces automatically follow the best practices.

My quantitative lab study results demonstrated that the annotation-based approach consistently outperformed the library-based approach in terms of time on task, cognitive load and perceived usefulness and usability to developers. I also showed in my qualitative analysis that participants felt adding annotations was a better approach than using the library. They preferred using annotations because it improved productivity, reduced mental load, was easier to learn and use, made code easier to comprehend, and could provide benefits for teamwork. Overall, adding annotations was perceived as a simple task and only led to a small extra effort, because the annotation and UI configuration XML design allowed them to write much less code and the IDE plugin offered sufficient suggestions and quick-fixes to streamline the task. They felt the Honeysuckle library more complicated to use and required more work than annotations, but still considered it useful since no such tool exists either. Note that both approaches were new to developers who participated in my study. Only three out of the twelve participants had previously used annotations for any kind of code generation, though all participants picked up the annotation-based approach and finished the task much faster than the library-based approach.

In a broader sense, some of my design considerations may increase the likelihood for Honeysuckle to be adopted, based on lessons learned about why model-based user interface design (MBUID) [105, 142] did not achieve widespread adoption. Instead of solving the generic UI implementation issue, I focus on privacy notice generation specifically and try to minimize the implications on regular app development tasks. Furthermore, given the low adoption of in-app privacy notices, developers likely have not established preferences for building their own interfaces, one of the barriers that prevented the adoption of MBUID [142].

5.4.2 Increasing Developers' Incentives to Improve Privacy

Many privacy-related requirements currently in place for Android and Google Play impose many restrictions on what data developers can use [88]. Conversely, I argue that requiring developers to create more privacy notices to improve transparency will cause little to no impact on the apps' functionality, which makes developers potentially more amenable to them. Furthermore, by making it easier to create privacy notices, we may be able to nudge developers who care about users' privacy to adopt more effective designs.

As suggested in prior research [31, 94], providing more detailed privacy notices for legitimate data practices is likely to not only improve users' perceived comprehension and control of their

privacy, but also make users more comfortable with allowing the app to access their data and trust the app more. Nowadays, there seems to be a growing interest in both academia and industry to build applications that can provide benefits to users and preserve privacy at the same time, but the common technical approach is still to minimize data practices, such as using differential privacy, federated learning, and on-device training and inference. With the current permission system, there is still a gap between users' perceptions and the actual data practices [88], and my tool can potentially address this problem and make developers' effort in protecting user privacy more visible to users.

5.4.3 Limitations of Honeysuckle

I chose a relatively simple code analysis method for Honeysuckle implementation, which is to search for all API calls that match a predefined source and sink API list. Although the code analysis subsystem is largely adapted from Coconut [85] and is not my main contribution, I want to discuss limitations in the current implementation and point out potential mitigation methods. First, the detected sinks may not actually store or send *sensitive data* off the device. Although I allow developers to manually add annotations to mark non-sensitive sinks, this process can be tedious and error-prone, especially for teamwork. Given that researchers have built tools to statically analyze data flows of compiled Android apps [23], a potential solution is to investigate how to conduct in-IDE data flow analysis over the source code and give developers hints and warnings for more efficient and accurate annotation filling. Second, my sensitive API list does not guarantee a full coverage. To improve the coverage, we can integrate existing methods [25, 125] to automatically identify source and sink APIs for different versions of Android. For third-party libraries, Honeysuckle solely relies on a curated list of popular third-party libraries. Since prior work suggests the usage of third-party libraries in Android apps follows a long-tail distribution [38], a potential solution is to combine a predefined third-party API list to cover the majority of cases with on-demand analysis to handle edge cases. Furthermore, Honeysuckle does not support customizing the styles and themes of the generated UI. This feature is straightforward to implement by allowing developers to specify their own style and theme XMLs⁶ to Honeysuckle.

5.4.4 Future Work: Going Further from Honeysuckle and Privacy Notice Generation

Despite the promising benefits, a developer tool for generating privacy notices alone can not solve all challenges facing the adoption of privacy notices and privacy by design in general. Therefore, I propose some follow-up work ideas to further improve privacy based on Honeysuckle and annotation-based privacy notice generation.

⁶<https://developer.android.com/guide/topics/ui/look-and-feel/themes>

Engaging Other Stakeholders to Enforce and Stimulate Accurate Privacy Notice

Honeysuckle relies on developers to provide accurate input to generate useful privacy notices. This could lead to the issue of “dishonest developers”, which was also brought up by my participants (Section 5.3.6). Hence, I discuss potential methods to enforce or stimulate accurate privacy notices beyond building developer tools. First, the internal privacy auditing teams or the app store need to check if developers have provided correct information in their annotations. As I have alluded to earlier, to supplement the free-form purpose string, we can add another annotation field that requires developers to declare a purpose category, using a set of predefined options. Then app reviewers may be able to infer the purpose category to cross check the annotations. An alternative approach is to generating code to log, synthesize, and help users visualize what data is collected, retained, or sent off the device. The rationale here is to give users, privacy researchers, and consumer advocates the ability to cross check what data practices are declared by developers against actual data practices. Similar ideas can be found in both research and commercial systems. For example, the iOS background location history dialog renders the location traces collected by the app on a map along with a rationale string provided by the developer. Harbach et al. [64] demonstrated visualization design using personal examples to improve the communication of privacy risks.

Other Opportunities of Improving Transparency and Control Using Annotations

Currently, Honeysuckle works as a standalone tool, but I envision that privacy annotations, the Honeysuckle IDE plugin, and build system plugin could be more tightly integrated into the Android ecosystem. For example, annotations can be embedded into compiled apps, which would let the operating system generate unified interfaces for all apps and allow users to manage global settings about the appearances and frequency of notices, as well as when and where to see notices to avoid notification overload. As another example, having annotations embedded into compiled apps could make it easier to check the behavior of apps by app stores, researchers, and consumer advocates. By expanding the kinds of annotations developers have to add, it would be possible to generate a summary of the app’s behaviors, such as what websites or cloud services it accesses and what data it sends. This kind of summary could augment the existing privacy interfaces, help users make decisions about whether to install an app (e.g. see PrivacyGrade.org), and help developers fulfill new requirements such as providing privacy labels for iOS apps.

Stepping back, I believe that a compelling vision for privacy is to have developers annotate their code just once, which can then help those developers with a number of privacy-related tasks (so that they will want to include accurate annotations), as well as make apps easier to audit by users and third parties. A challenge here is defining a unified and complete enough set of annotations that can cover all of these use cases.

Chapter 6

Proposed Work: Annotation-Guided Privacy Nutrition Label Creation

6.1 Overview

Driven by developers' general needs for privacy-enhancing support (detailed in Chapter 3), my prior work explored a specific type of solution: privacy-enhancing development environment.

My first attempt Coconut [85] is an Android Studio plugin that offer developer real-time feedback on privacy issues (**Increase Engagement - Need #7 Increase Awareness**) and quick-fixes (**Lessen Burden - Need #5 Scaffold and Streamline Privacy Tasks**). Coconut also offers an interactive overview panel that summarizes all the data collection and transmission activities based on the annotations (**Support Auditing - Need #3**).

Then I designed Honeysuckle [90] on top of Coconut, which supports annotation-guided generation of in-app privacy notices (**Lessen Burden - Need #4 Offload Privacy Tasks**).

My recent studies about Apple privacy nutrition labels suggest that many developers have little awareness and knowledge about this new requirement and have trouble in complying with it accurately and efficiently [91, 93]. I hypothesize that Android developers may face similar issues as Google has announced a similar requirement for privacy nutrition labels. Hence, in my proposed work, I plan to extend Coconut and Honeysuckle to design an Android Studio plugin (tentatively named *Matcha*) that can facilitate Android developers to generate a privacy nutrition label based on their annotations (**Lessen Burden - Need #5 Scaffold and Streamline Privacy Tasks**), remind developers to update privacy labels (**Increase Engagement - Need #7 Increase Awareness**). Since the two major app stores now require developers to create privacy nutrition labels, there are natural incentives for developers to install the tool (**Increase Engagement - Need #8 Incentivize Adoption**). Meanwhile, because I will propose a unified design of privacy annotation that is compatible with Coconut, Honeysuckle, and Matcha, the developers that annotate the code for generating privacy labels can also take advantage of other privacy features. Although my current plan is limited to creating Google privacy nutrition labels, future work can involve helping cross-platform apps comply with both platforms' requirements of creating a privacy nutrition label and reconcile the subtle difference between their requirements (**Lessen burden - Need # 6 Reduce Task Overload**).




Figure 6.1: An example of iOS’ privacy labels (left) and Android’s tentative design for its forthcoming safety section (right).

To approach this goal, I plan to go through a five-step process: 1) Proposing a unified annotation design that can simultaneously serve the design goals of Coconut, Honeysuckle, and Matcha; 2) Conducting developer studies to understand their challenges for creating Android privacy nutrition labels; 3) Creating design prototypes for early feedback from developers; 4) Finalizing the design and implementing the tool. 5) Evaluating the design and implementation using lab-based and in-the-wild studies.

6.1.1 Background: Privacy Nutrition Label in Major App Stores

In December 2020, the Apple App Store introduced *App Privacy Details*¹ to help users learn about the privacy practices of an app before downloading it. The privacy details are shown in the *App Privacy* section when installing the app (Figure 6.1 left). This section contains two layers. On the first layer, users can see the high-level data categories that the app collects (e.g., location) and whether this data category is linked to users or used to track users. Users can click the *see details* link to see the second layer, which includes more specific data types (e.g.,

¹<https://developer.apple.com/app-store/app-privacy-details/>

Coarse/Precise location), what the data is used for (e.g., Third-Party Advertising, App Functionality), and whether each data type is linked to users or used to track users. If the developer has reported that no data is collected by the app, the *App Privacy* section shows *Data Not Collected*. If the developer has not filled out the privacy details, this section shows *No Privacy Details Provided*. Following Apple’s introduction of the privacy nutrition label concept into the App Store, Android also announced their version of privacy nutrition labels – *the Safety Section*². By April 2022, all developers that published apps on the Google Play Store must declare how they collect and handle user data by filling out a form in the Google Play Console. Although the Safety Section is not available on the Google Play Store for consumers yet, Google has released a preview of the visual design of the privacy label (Figure 6.1 right) and opened the system on their developer console to fill out forms to create the label.

The privacy nutrition labels of both platforms provide similar information, while they are described in different terms (e.g., Apple: data collection, data linked to users, data used to track users; Google: collected data, shared data). The definitions of the same word may also differ a lot between the two platforms. For example, per Google’s definition, “Collect” means transmitting data from your app off a user’s device. While Apple’s definition is “Collect” refers to transmitting data off the device *and storing it in a readable form for longer than the time it takes you and/or your third-party partners to service the request*. The second part of Apple’s definition makes the data collection behaviors specified for their privacy nutrition labels a subset of the data collection behaviors on Google’s privacy nutrition labels. This may potentially cause trouble for cross-platform apps that need to comply with both platforms’ requirements.

6.2 Unifying Privacy Annotation Design

A key idea I propose for my dissertation work is *privacy annotation*, a type of structured metadata that embeds privacy information such as data use purposes directly in code. Unlike a separate specification file such as the manifest file for Android apps, privacy annotations are attached where personal data is first accessed by the app or any data is transmitted off the device. This property makes some context information naturally embodied in the locations of privacy annotations, which allows privacy annotations to carry rich information about privacy practices while only requiring developers to do a small amount of annotating work.

A key idea underlying the design of Coconut and Honeysuckle is that by asking developers to annotate their code once, the developer tools should provide developers with multiple types of benefits (either privacy-related or not). In Coconut, privacy annotations can complement the code analysis results to provide relevant privacy suggestions for developers. In Honeysuckle, privacy annotations can guide the generation and auto-integration of various types of in-app privacy notices. In both systems, there are auto-generated reminders and quick-fixes to help developers add privacy annotations, and an interactive overview panel generated based on the privacy annotations that allow developers to see all data access and egress instances and check the corresponding source code of any instance with a click.

Accordingly, a main design goal of Matcha is that it should provide new values for developers

²<https://support.google.com/googleplay/android-developer/answer/10787469?hl=en>

while still be compatible with the two preceding systems. To achieve the goal, the first step is to create a unified design of privacy annotations that are both able to support the new task and compatible with previous designs.

From Coconut to Honeysuckle, I have made two main changes to improve the annotation design. First, I merged the different types of data source annotations (e.g., `@LocationAnnotation` and `@UniqueIdentifierAnnotation`) into one unified data source annotation (`@Source`) and defined an attribute in the source annotation to represent the data type (`sourceData`). This modification makes the annotation more succinct and makes it easier to expand the list of supported data types. Second, I defined a new attribute in the sink annotation named (`sources`) to allow developers to explicitly specify from which sources the data flows to this sink. This feature allows for a simple solution to documenting data flows so Honeysuckle can generate privacy notices that alert users about potential data transmission when the data is just accessed or when the app requests permissions to access the data. I will retain the two changes in the final design for Matcha.

Based on Google’s privacy nutrition label design, I propose the privacy annotation design as demonstrated in Figure 6.2. This design uses a similar architecture as Honeysuckle annotations (see details in Table 5.1) with three main changes to accommodate the new task and reduce developers’ burden.

First, I changed the annotation name `@Source` and `@Sink` to `@DataAccess` and `@DataTransmission` because my previous developer studies have suggested that developers were not familiar with the terms “source” and “sink” and the new names also better align with Google’s taxonomy.

Second, I created two new attributes for the `@DataTransmission` annotation, namely `CollectionAttribute` and `SharingAttribute`. They are enum variables that contain a list of pre-defined options for describing how the collected data is used and how the data is shared with third parties. The pre-define options include data use purposes and also other attributes such as `EndToEndEncryption` and `OptionalCollection`. Therefore, the `purposeName` attribute in the Honeysuckle annotation is replaced with the two more general attributes.

Third, I removed the `purposeName` attribute from the `@DataAccess` annotation. The direct reason is Google only counts transmitting data off the device as data collection and only requests developers to provide a purpose when the data is transmitted off the device. In addition, the privacy risks would be minimal if the data is only read into the memory but not written to local storage or sent to the network. As such, it is reasonable to focus on the egress end and only solicit detailed information about privacy practices from developers at this point. I want to note that tracking and annotating data accesses are still important because they can be more accurately and easily detected by scanning sensitive API calls and they need to be further linked with data transmission annotations to indicate which data is collected under Google’s definition.

Annotation Definition	Annotation Instance Example
<pre>public @interface DataAccess { int id(); DataType[] dataType(); }</pre>	<pre>@DataAccess(id = R.string.getLocationForPersonalization_getLastKnownLocation, dataType = DataType.PreciseLocation) Location location = locManager.getLastKnownLocation(LocationManager.GPS_PROVIDER);</pre>
<pre>public @interface DataTransmission { int[] accessId(); CollectionAttribute[] collectionAttribute(); SharingAttribute[] sharingAttribute(); }</pre>	<pre>@DataTransmission(accessId = {R.string.getLocationForPersonalization_getLastKnownLocation}, collectionAttribute = { CollectionAttribute.ForAppFunctionality, CollectionAttribute.ForAnalytics, CollectionAttribute.StoredInBackend }, sharingAttribute = { SharingAttribute.NotSharedWithThirdParty }) StringRequest stringRequest = new StringRequest(Request.Method.GET, url,</pre>

Figure 6.2: Matcha Annotation Definition and Examples

6.3 Android Developer Survey: Understanding Challenges for Creating Privacy Labels

The interviews that I conducted with iOS developers have demonstrated that accurately filling out privacy labels is a challenging task for developers [91], I consider that Android developers would face similar problems and need better support to streamline this process and improve accuracy. Since developers’ misunderstanding of Apple’s terminology is a salient challenge for creating accurate privacy labels, I plan to first conduct a survey study to examine developers’ perceptions of Google’s terminology of the privacy nutrition label.

The iOS developer interview identified two causes of developers’ misunderstanding of terms. First, developers relied on their preconceptions of a term that differed from Apple’s definitions. For example, the term “tracking” immediately reminded many participants of “location tracking” or “user behavior tracking”, while per Apple’s definition, it only refers to linking data with third-party data for advertising purposes. Therefore, the first goal of the survey study is to identify similar cases for Google’s terms and definitions so I can incorporate countermeasures when designing Matcha.

Second, developers found many confusing expressions in Apple’s definitions including unfamiliar technical concepts (e.g., hashed email address), privacy jargon (e.g., data broker), and concepts that do not exist in their countries (e.g., credit score). Therefore, the second goal of the survey study is to identify confusion expressions in Google’s definitions so I can design corresponding guidance in Matcha.

I plan to recruit participants who are Android developers using Prolific³. Before launching the formal study, I will conduct think-aloud studies to test the survey design. The survey will consist of two parts to tackle the two problems respectively, as detailed below.

³<http://prolific.co>

Google's Definition	Survey Question Example
<p>Data collection</p> <p>"Collect" means transmitting data from your app off a user's device. Please note the following guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Libraries and SDKs: This includes user data transmitted off device from your app by libraries and/or SDKs used in your app, irrespective of whether data is transmitted to you or a third party server. • Webview: It also includes user data collected from a webview which has been opened from your app, if your app is in control of the code/behavior delivered through that webview. • You do not need to declare data collection from a webview in which users are navigating the open web. • Ephemeral processing: User data transmitted off device that is processed ephemeral needs to be included in your form response, but if it meets the standard below, it will not be disclosed in your app's Data safety section on the Play Store. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Processed "ephemerally" means that the data is only stored in memory, retained for no longer than necessary to service the specific request in real-time, and not used for any other purpose. • Pseudonymous data: User data collected pseudonymously must be disclosed. For example, data that can reasonably be re-associated with a user must be disclosed. <p>Not in scope for data collection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following use cases do not need to be disclosed as collected: • On-device access/processing: User data accessed by your app that is only processed locally on the user's device and not sent off device does not need to be disclosed • End-to-end encryption: User data that is sent off device, but that is unreadable by you or anyone other than the sender and recipient as a result of end-to-end encryption does not need to be disclosed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The encrypted data must not be readable by any intermediary entity, including the developer, and only sender and recipient may have necessary keys. 	<p>Imagine that your app has the following data practice. Please select how you would report this data practice for user's message in your app's privacy nutrition label.</p> <p><i>Your app encrypts the user's message before it is sent to another user, where it is decrypted.</i></p> <p> <input type="checkbox"/> Data collection <input type="checkbox"/> Data sharing <input type="checkbox"/> Both <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Neither </p>

Figure 6.3: Relationship between Google's definition and the survey question design. I will extract items from the definition and create a fictional scenario description to test developers' understanding for each item.

6.3.1 Part I: Examine Developers' Understanding of Terms

In this part, I will examine developers' understanding of *data collection*, *data sharing*, and the 14 data categories⁴. The goal is to identify for each term which parts of the definition developers are more likely to have an incorrect understanding of.

I will design the survey to approximate the questions that developers need to answer in real life to create privacy nutrition labels. As illustrated in Figure 6.3, I will extract items from Google's definition of data collection and data sharing and develop each item into a fictional scenario description to test developers' understanding of it.

As illustrated in Figure 6.4, the definition of each data category contains multiple data types, and there is a description for each data type that provides multiple examples of the data type. Therefore, developers may not immediately be reminded of their data collection behavior if only looking at the data category name, while showing all three levels of the definition will cause information overload. To identify data categories that are less intuitive than other categories or contain examples that loosely associate with the data category name in developers' perceptions, I will first curate a list of data type examples based on Google's definitions, and then randomly select a number of items from this list for each participant to test their understanding. Below is a question example:

⁴The 14 data categories include *Location*, *Personal info*, *Financial info*, *Health and fitness*, *Messages*, *Photos or videos*, *Audio files*, *Files and docs*, *Calendar*, *Contacts*, *App activity*, *Web browsing*, *App info and performance*, *Device or other identifiers*

App activity	Page views and taps in app	Information about how a user interacts with your app. For example, the number of page views or the screen coordinates of taps.
	In-app search history	Information about what a user has searched for in your app.
	Installed apps	Information about the apps installed on a user's device.
	Other user-generated content	Any other user-generated content not listed here, or in any other section. For example, user bios or notes.
	Other actions	Any other user activity or actions in-app not listed here such as gameplay and likes.

Figure 6.4: Google’s definition of the data category “App activity”.

Imagine that *your app collects: loading time, MAC address, Screen coordinates of button presses*. Select all of the user data categories collected or shared by your app.

The options are all the 14 data categories and *none of the above*. The correct answer is: App Information and Performance, Device or other identifiers, App Activity.

This method allows us to test multiple data types at once, which both reduce the length of the survey and increase the ecological validity of the task.

In addition to these questions, I will also add attention check questions and add trivial questions as validity check questions for this scenario-description-based method. An example of the validity check question is showing the scenario description “Your app collects GPS location.” – The correct answer is “data collection”. If the correct rate of this question is high, it means that presenting scenario descriptions in this format is a reasonable approach to emulate the real-world tasks with pre-defined scenarios.

6.3.2 Part II: Identify Confusing Expressions in Definitions

The second part of the survey will randomly select the definitions of certain terms for each participant, and ask the participant to highlight which part of the definition felt confusing, unclear, or unreasonable to them.

6.4 Creating and Testing Design Prototypes

Next I will create lo-fi and mid-fi prototypes of Matcha and conduct think-aloud tests with Android developers to make sure the tool is easy to understand and use.

I envision that there will be two main use cases for Matcha. First, the developer needs to create a privacy label for a completed app. To support this need, I can either design a wizard UI to guide developers through the privacy label process and automatically insert privacy annotations to save the results in the code, or guide developers to directly add all required annotations at once. The unique benefits of an IDE plugin for this task is that the tool has access to the source code, so it can provide developers with suggestions and auto-completion features based on code scanning results including sensitive data access and data transmission by first-party code and third-party libraries that may collect sensitive data. A challenge for the design is how to exploit developers' knowledge about their apps and avoid errors due to misunderstandings of the privacy label and cognitive biases. The findings from the developer survey should provide useful insights to inform the tool design.

The second use case is that developers add privacy annotations as they code. In this case, the information overload issues will be greatly ameliorated because developers only need to focus on one data access/transmission instance at a time. However, the challenge is the activity is more fragmented and developers need to undergo many context switchings between implementing features and adding annotations to fulfill Google's requirements. Therefore, the annotating process should be simple and follow a unified pattern. For terms such as "Processed ephemerally"⁵ that are likely to be unfamiliar or confusing to developers, the design of the corresponding attribute values in the annotation may need to be reframed or broken down to familiar and straightforward concepts to developers. This part of the design can also be informed by the survey findings.

6.5 System Implementation

Matcha will be implemented as an Android Studio plugin by extending Coconut and Honeysuckle, so it will keep the same features including privacy warnings, quick-fixes, and the overview panel. The Google Play developer console supports exporting the safety form as a CSV and importing a CSV file to complete the form. Hence, Matcha will support two modes: the *creation* mode and the *verification* mode.. In the creation mode, it can help developers annotate the code and export a CSV file to complete the form on the Google Play Console. In the verification mode, it can process a CSV file imported by the developer and provide warnings and suggestions for fixes based on code analysis results.

To help developers specify data practices for third-party libraries they use, I will gather a list of third-party libraries that have provided documentation for the task to automatically generate the answers. For libraries that do not have such documentation support, I will try to extract relevant information from the Apple privacy label documentation if one exists, leverage stack trace analysis from prior research [38], or inform developers of the issue.

Although Google has provided a guideline listing permissions and APIs that need to be reported in the privacy label⁶, this list is far from complete. For example, sensitive information can be collected via a text input field, while only analyzing the API type can not yield the precise data type. One potential mitigation method is to provide intelligent suggestions by analyzing

⁵'Processed ephemerally' means that the data is only stored in memory, and is retained for no longer than necessary to service the specific request in real-time, and not used for any other purpose.

⁶<https://developer.android.com/guide/topics/data/collect-share>

the variable names, file names, and comments, while a design challenge is how to not let false predictions bias developers.

6.6 Matcha Evaluation

6.6.1 Use Case #1: Creating Privacy Label for a Completed App

I plan to first study how Android developers use the baseline method and Matcha to create a privacy label for a completed app. The metrics of interest include the time performance, cognitive load, and the accuracy of the generated label.

This study will consist of two parts. In the first part, I will give developers a few days to implement the same features that involve data collection and sharing for an app using the vanilla Android Studio. In this way, I can both control the app behavior and study how participants create the privacy nutrition label for an app that they developed.

The second part of the study will happen around one or two weeks after the participant finishes the development task. It will be a lab study following a between-subjects design. Participants will be randomly assigned to the control group and the experimental group. The control group will create the privacy label using Google's web console and the vanilla Android Studio. The experimental group will create the privacy label using Matcha Android Studio. I will record the time they spend on this task and the generated privacy label, ask them to fill out the NASA-TLX questionnaire, and interview them to obtain subjective feedback.

6.6.2 Use Case #2: Adding Privacy Annotations While Programming

In the second study, I plan to recruit developers to implement the same features as the first study using a Matcha Android Studio, so I can gain better understanding in how developers add privacy annotations while programming in a more naturalistic environment. I will add telemetry features in Matcha to log the total time spent on different in-IDE activities and compare the time they spent on the annotating task with other activities. After the developers complete the task, I will conduct follow-up surveys with all participants and interview some participants to further understand their experiences and feelings.

This will be an exploratory study with the following goals:

- Measure the portion of the time spent on adding annotations among all time spent within the IDE.
- Test whether developers can create the annotations accurately and generate the privacy label accurate when working on realistic development tasks.
- Test whether developers consider Matcha easy to use, provide useful functionality, and perceive adding annotations a low-cost task.
- Conduct in-depth characterization of how developers use Matcha (e.g., visualize when they add annotations, when they correct annotations, whether they correctly update annotations after changing code)

	2022/3	2022/4	2022/05	2022/06	2022/07	2022/08	2022/09	2022/10	2022/11	2022/12	2023/01	2023/2
Android Developer Survey												
Creating and Testing Design Prototypes												
System Implementation												
Evaluation #1												
Evaluation #2												
Thesis writing and defense												

Figure 6.5: A timeline of the plans for completing my proposed work.

6.7 Proposed Timeline

Figure 6.5 illustrates a timeline of the plans for completing my proposed work. I aim to finish and defend my thesis in Feb, 2023.

Bibliography

- [1] Americans and privacy: Concerned, confused and feeling lack of control over their personal information — pew research center. <https://web.archive.org/web/20220214011554/https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2019/11/15/americans-and-privacy-concerned-confused-and-feeling-lack-of-control-over-their-personal-information/>. (Accessed on 02/15/2022). 2.1
- [2] Apple contractors were allegedly listening to 1,000 siri recordings a day — each - the verge. <https://web.archive.org/web/20220101115259/https://www.theverge.com/2019/8/23/20830120/apple-contractors-siri-recordings-listening-1000-a-day-globetech-microsoft-cortana>. (Accessed on 02/16/2022). 2.1.1
- [3] Ccpa opt-out icon — state of california - department of justice - office of the attorney general. <http://web.archive.org/web/20210902015740/https://oag.ca.gov/privacy/ccpa/icons-download>. (Accessed on 02/17/2022). 2.3.2
- [4] Github - ghostwords/chameleon: Browser fingerprinting protection for everybody. <https://github.com/ghostwords/chameleon>. (Accessed on 02/17/2022). 2.2.2
- [5] Google workers can listen to what people say to its ai home devices — google assistant — the guardian. <https://web.archive.org/web/20220201125102/https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2019/jul/11/google-home-assistant-listen-recordings-users-privacy>. (Accessed on 02/16/2022). 2.1.2
- [6] Privacy badger. <http://web.archive.org/web/20220216040654/https://privacybadger.org/>. (Accessed on 02/17/2022). 2.2.2
- [7] The facebook and cambridge analytica scandal, explained with a simple diagram - vox. <https://web.archive.org/web/20220207161110/https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2018/3/23/17151916/facebook-cambridge-analytica-trump-diagram>. (Accessed on 02/16/2022). 2.1.1
- [8] Yep, human workers are listening to recordings from google assistant, too - the verge. <https://web.archive.org/web/20220122175849/https://www.theverge.com/2019/7/11/20690020/google-assistant-home->

[human-contractors-listening-recordings-vrt-nws](#). (Accessed on 02/16/2022). **2.1.1**

- [9] Improve your code with lint. Available at <https://developer.android.com/studio/write/lint.html> (2017/05/14), 2017. **2.4.2**
- [10] Chapter 20. california consumer privacy act regulations (feb 2020 revision). <https://web.archive.org/web/20200619170238/https://www.oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/privacy/ccpa-text-of-mod-redline-020720.pdf>, 2 2020. (Accessed on 09/13/2020). **5.1.1**
- [11] Github - permissions-dispatcher/permissionsdispatcher: A declarative and comprehensive api to handle android runtime permissions. <https://web.archive.org/web/20201205195815/https://github.com/permissions-dispatcher/PermissionsDispatcher>, 2021. (Accessed on 02/13/2021). **5.1.2**
- [12] Privacy - features - apple. <https://web.archive.org/web/20210126192113/https://www.apple.com/privacy/features/>, 2021. (Accessed on 01/29/2021). **2.1.3, 5.1**
- [13] Privacy in android 11 — android developers. <https://web.archive.org/web/20210129195758/https://developer.android.com/about/versions/11/privacy>, 2021. (Accessed on 01/29/2021). **5.1**
- [14] Requesting consent from european users — android — google developers. <https://web.archive.org/web/20201109005634/https://developers.google.com/admob/android/eu-consent>, 2021. (Accessed on 02/13/2021). **5.1.2**
- [15] Noura Abdi, Kopo M Ramokapane, and Jose M Such. More than smart speakers: security and privacy perceptions of smart home personal assistants. In *Fifteenth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security ({SOUPS} 2019)*, pages 451–466, 2019. **1**
- [16] Yasemin Acar, Michael Backes, Sascha Fahl, Doowon Kim, Michelle L. Mazurek, and Christian Stransky. You get where you're looking for: The impact of information sources on code security. In *2016 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, may 2016. doi: 10.1109/sp.2016.25. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/sp.2016.25>. **2.4.1, 2.4.2, 4.1, 4.4.6**
- [17] Yasemin Acar, Sascha Fahl, and Michelle L. Mazurek. You are not your developer, either: A research agenda for usable security and privacy research beyond end users. In *2016 IEEE Cybersecurity Development (SecDev)*. IEEE, nov 2016. doi: 10.1109/secdev.2016.013. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/secdev.2016.013>. **2.4.1, 4.1, 4.5.4**
- [18] Yasemin Acar, Michael Backes, Sascha Fahl, Simson Garfinkel, Doowon Kim, Michelle L. Mazurek, and Christian Stransky. Comparing the usability of cryptographic APIs. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, may 2017. doi: 10.1109/sp.2017.52. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/sp.2017.52>. **2.4.1, 4.1**
- [19] Yuvraj Agarwal and Malcolm Hall. ProtectMyPrivacy: detecting and mitigating privacy

- leaks on ios devices using crowdsourcing. In *Proceeding of the 11th annual international conference on Mobile systems, applications, and services - MobiSys '13*. ACM Press, 2013. doi: 10.1145/2462456.2464460. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2462456.2464460>. 2.2.2, 4.1
- [20] Hazim Almuhimedi, Florian Schaub, Norman Sadeh, Idris Adjerid, Alessandro Acquisti, Joshua Gluck, Lorrie Faith Cranor, and Yuvraj Agarwal. Your location has been shared 5,398 times!: A field study on mobile app privacy nudging. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, apr 2015. doi: 10.1145/2702123.2702210. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2702123.2702210>. 2.2.1, 5.1, 5.2.1
- [21] Benjamin Andow, Samin Yaseer Mahmud, Wenyu Wang, Justin Whitaker, William Enck, Bradley Reaves, Kapil Singh, and Tao Xie. PolicyLint: Investigating internal privacy policy contradictions on google play. In *28th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 19)*, pages 585–602, Santa Clara, CA, August 2019. USENIX Association. ISBN 978-1-939133-06-9. URL <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity19/presentation/andow>. 2.1.3
- [22] Benjamin Andow, Samin Yaseer Mahmud, Justin Whitaker, William Enck, Bradley Reaves, Kapil Singh, and Serge Egelman. Actions speak louder than words: Entity-Sensitive privacy policy and data flow analysis with PoliCheck. In *29th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 20)*, pages 985–1002. USENIX Association, August 2020. ISBN 978-1-939133-17-5. URL <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity20/presentation/andow>. 2.1.3
- [23] Steven Arzt, Siegfried Rasthofer, Christian Fritz, Eric Bodden, Alexandre Bartel, Jacques Klein, Yves Le Traon, Damien Octeau, and Patrick McDaniel. FlowDroid: precise context, flow, field, object-sensitive and lifecycle-aware taint analysis for android apps. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, 49(6):259–269, jun 2014. doi: 10.1145/2666356.2594299. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2666356.2594299>. 2.4.2, 5.2.3, 5.4.3
- [24] GSM Association. Mobile privacy principles, promoting consumer privacy in the mobile ecosystem. Available at <http://www.gsma.com/publicpolicy/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/GSMA-Privacy-Principles.pdf> (2017/05/14), 2012. 2.4.2
- [25] Kathy Wain Yee Au, Yi Fan Zhou, Zhen Huang, and David Lie. PScout: analyzing the android permission specification. In *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM conference on Computer and communications security - CCS '12*. ACM Press, 2012. doi: 10.1145/2382196.2382222. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2382196.2382222>. 5.4.3
- [26] Rebecca Balebako and Lorrie Cranor. Improving app privacy: Nudging app developers to protect user privacy. *IEEE Security & Privacy*, 12(4):55–58, jul 2014. doi: 10.1109/msp.2014.70. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/msp.2014.70>. 2.4.1, 4.1, 5.2
- [27] Rebecca Balebako, Jaeyeon Jung, Wei Lu, Lorrie Faith Cranor, and Carolyn Nguyen. "little brothers watching you": raising awareness of data leaks on smartphones. In *Proceedings of the Ninth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security - SOUPS '13*. ACM

- Press, 2013. doi: 10.1145/2501604.2501616. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2501604.2501616>. 2.2.1, 5.2.1
- [28] Rebecca Balebako, Abigail Marsh, Jialiu Lin, Jason Hong, and Lorrie Faith Cranor. The privacy and security behaviors of smartphone app developers. In *Proceedings 2014 Workshop on Usable Security*. Internet Society, 2014. doi: 10.14722/usec.2014.23006. URL <https://doi.org/10.14722/usec.2014.23006>. 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 3.1, 3.6.3, 4.1, 4.3.2, 5.1, 5.1.2, 5.2.3
- [29] Rebecca Balebako, Florian Schaub, Idris Adjerid, Alessandro Acquisti, and Lorrie Cranor. The impact of timing on the salience of smartphone app privacy notices. In *Proceedings of the 5th Annual ACM CCS Workshop on Security and Privacy in Smartphones and Mobile Devices*. ACM, oct 2015. doi: 10.1145/2808117.2808119. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2808117.2808119>. 2.2.1
- [30] Carlos Bermejo Fernandez, Dimitris Chatzopoulos, Dimitrios Papadopoulos, and Pan Hui. This website uses nudging: Mturk workers' behaviour on cookie consent notices. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 5(CSCW2):1–22, 2021. 2.3.1
- [31] Bram Bonné, Sai Teja Peddinti, Igor Bilogrevic, and Nina Taft. Exploring decision making with android's runtime permission dialogs using in-context surveys. In *Thirteenth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security (SOUPS 2017)*, pages 195–210, 2017. 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 5.4.2
- [32] Joel Brandt, Mira Dontcheva, Marcos Weskamp, and Scott R. Klemmer. Example-centric programming. In *Proceedings of the 28th international conference on Human factors in computing systems - CHI '10*. ACM Press, 2010. doi: 10.1145/1753326.1753402. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1753326.1753402>. 4.5.4
- [33] Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2):77–101, jan 2006. doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa. URL <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>. 5.3.6
- [34] Giovanni Campagna, Rakesh Ramesh, Silei Xu, Michael Fischer, and Monica S Lam. Almond: The architecture of an open, crowdsourced, privacy-preserving, programmable virtual assistant. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on World Wide Web*, pages 341–350, 2017. 1
- [35] Yi Chen, Mingming Zha, Nan Zhang, Dandan Xu, Qianqian Zhao, Xuan Feng, Kan Yuan, Fnu Suya, Yuan Tian, Kai Chen, et al. Demystifying hidden privacy settings in mobile apps. In *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 570–586. IEEE, 2019. 2.1.3
- [36] W. Cheng, Qin Zhao, Bei Yu, and S. Hiroshige. TaintTrace: Efficient flow tracing with dynamic binary rewriting. In *11th IEEE Symposium on Computers and Communications (ISCC'06)*. IEEE, 2006. doi: 10.1109/iscc.2006.158. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/iscc.2006.158>. 2.4.2
- [37] Erika Chin, Adrienne Porter Felt, Kate Greenwood, and David Wagner. Analyzing inter-application communication in android. In *Proceedings of the 9th international conference on Mobile systems, applications, and services - MobiSys '11*. ACM

Press, 2011. doi: 10.1145/1999995.2000018. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1999995.2000018>. 4.1

- [38] Saksham Chitkara, Nishad Gothoskar, Suhas Harish, Jason I. Hong, and Yuvraj Agarwal. Does this app really need my location?: Context-aware privacy management for smartphones. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies*, 1(3):1–22, sep 2017. doi: 10.1145/3132029. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3132029>. 2.2.2, 4.2.3, 5.2.1, 5.2.4, 5.4.3, 6.5
- [39] Camille Cobb, Lucy Simko, Tadayoshi Kohno, and Alexis Hiniker. User experiences with online status indicators. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–12, 2020. 1, 2.1.2
- [40] Federal Trade Commission. Mobile privacy disclosures: Building trust through transparency: a federal trade commission staff report. <https://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/reports/mobile-privacy-disclosures-building-trust-through-transparency-federal-trade-commission-staff-report/130201mobileprivacyreport.pdf>, 2013. (Accessed on 08/02/2021). 2.2.1, 2.4.2
- [41] Lorrie Faith Cranor. P3p: Making privacy policies more useful. *IEEE Security & Privacy*, 1(6):50–55, 2003. 2.2.1
- [42] Lorrie Faith Cranor. Necessary but not sufficient: Standardized mechanisms for privacy notice and choice. *J. on Telecomm. & High Tech. L.*, 10:273, 2012. 2.2.1
- [43] Lorrie Faith Cranor, Hana Habib, Yixin Zou, Alessandro Acquisti, Joel Reidenberg, Norman Sadeh, and Florian Schaub. User testing of the proposed ccpa do-not-sell icon. *Submitted to California Office of Attorney General*, 2020. 2.3.2
- [44] Sauvik Das, Joanne Lo, Laura Dabbish, and Jason I Hong. Breaking! a typology of security and privacy news and how it's shared. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–12, 2018. 1
- [45] Fred D. Davis. Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3):319, sep 1989. doi: 10.2307/249008. URL <https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>. 5.3.3, 5.3.5
- [46] Martin Degeling, Christine Utz, Christopher Lentzsch, Henry Hosseini, Florian Schaub, and Thorsten Holz. We value your privacy... now take some cookies: Measuring the gdpr's impact on web privacy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.05096*, 2018. 2.3.1
- [47] Android Developer Document. App permissions best practices — android developers. <https://developer.android.com/training/permissions/usage-notes>, 2020. (Accessed on 09/17/2020). 5.2.1
- [48] Android Official Documentation. Best practices for permissions and identifiers. Available at <https://developer.android.com/training/best-permissions-ids.html> (2017/05/14), 2017. 2.4.2
- [49] Android Official Documentation. Best practices for unique identifiers. Available at <https://developer.android.com/training/articles/user-data->

[ids.html](#) (2017/05/14), 2017. ([document](#)), 4.3

- [50] Julia C Dunbar, Emily Bascom, Ashley Boone, and Alexis Hiniker. Is someone listening? audio-related privacy perceptions and design recommendations from guardians, pragmatists, and cynics. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies*, 5(3):1–23, 2021. [1](#)
- [51] Pardis Emami-Naeini, Yuvraj Agarwal, Lorrie Faith Cranor, and Hanan Hibshi. Ask the experts: What should be on an IoT privacy and security label? In *2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, may 2020. doi: 10.1109/sp40000.2020.00043. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/sp40000.2020.00043>. [2.2.1](#)
- [52] William Enck, Peter Gilbert, Seungyeop Han, Vasant Tendulkar, Byung-Gon Chun, Landon P. Cox, Jaeyeon Jung, Patrick McDaniel, and Anmol N. Sheth. TaintDroid: An information-flow tracking system for realtime privacy monitoring on smartphones. *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems*, 32(2):1–29, jun 2014. doi: 10.1145/2619091. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2619091>. [2.4.2](#), [4.1](#)
- [53] Steven Englehardt and Arvind Narayanan. Online tracking: A 1-million-site measurement and analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, pages 1388–1401, 2016. [2.2.2](#)
- [54] Benjamin Fabian, Tatiana Ermakova, and Tino Lentz. Large-scale readability analysis of privacy policies. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Web Intelligence*. ACM, aug 2017. doi: 10.1145/3106426.3106427. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3106426.3106427>. [2.2.1](#)
- [55] Adrienne Porter Felt, Elizabeth Ha, Serge Egelman, Ariel Haney, Erika Chin, and David Wagner. Android permissions: User attention, comprehension, and behavior. In *Proceedings of the Eighth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security - SOUPS '12*. ACM Press, 2012. doi: 10.1145/2335356.2335360. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2335356.2335360>. [2.1.3](#)
- [56] Felix Fischer, Konstantin Bottinger, Huang Xiao, Christian Stransky, Yasemin Acar, Michael Backes, and Sascha Fahl. Stack overflow considered harmful? the impact of copy&paste on android application security. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, may 2017. doi: 10.1109/sp.2017.31. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/sp.2017.31>. [2.4.1](#), [4.1](#)
- [57] Clint Gibler, Jonathan Crussell, Jeremy Erickson, and Hao Chen. AndroidLeaks: Automatically detecting potential privacy leaks in android applications on a large scale. In *Trust and Trustworthy Computing*, pages 291–307. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-30921-2_17. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-30921-2_17. [5.2.1](#)
- [58] Alyssa Glass, Deborah L. McGuinness, and Michael Wolverton. Toward establishing trust in adaptive agents. In *Proceedings of the 13th international conference on Intelligent user interfaces - IUI '08*. ACM Press, 2008. doi: 10.1145/1378773.1378804. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1378773.1378804>. [4.5.2](#)
- [59] Joshua Gluck, Florian Schaub, Amy Friedman, Hana Habib, Norman Sadeh, Lorrie Faith

- Cranor, and Yuvraj Agarwal. How short is too short? implications of length and framing on the effectiveness of privacy notices. In *Twelfth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security (SOUPS 2016)*, pages 321–340, 2016. [2.2.1](#)
- [60] Michael I. Gordon, Deokhwan Kim, Jeff Perkins, Limei Gilham, Nguyen Nguyen, and Martin Rinard. Information-flow analysis of android applications in DroidSafe. In *Proceedings 2015 Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*. Internet Society, 2015. doi: 10.14722/ndss.2015.23089. URL <https://doi.org/10.14722/ndss.2015.23089>. [2.4.2](#)
- [61] Hana Habib, Yixin Zou, Aditi Jannu, Neha Sridhar, Chelse Swoopes, Alessandro Acquisti, Lorrie Faith Cranor, Norman Sadeh, and Florian Schaub. An empirical analysis of data deletion and {Opt-Out} choices on 150 websites. In *Fifteenth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security (SOUPS 2019)*, pages 387–406, 2019. [2.1.3](#)
- [62] Hana Habib, Yixin Zou, Yaxing Yao, Alessandro Acquisti, Lorrie Cranor, Joel Reidenberg, Norman Sadeh, and Florian Schaub. Toggles, dollar signs, and triangles: How to (in) effectively convey privacy choices with icons and link texts. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–25, 2021. [2.3.2](#)
- [63] Irit Hadar, Tomer Hasson, Oshrat Ayalon, Eran Toch, Michael Birnhack, Sofia Sherman, and Arod Balissa. Privacy by designers: software developers’ privacy mindset. *Empirical Software Engineering*, 23(1):259–289, apr 2017. doi: 10.1007/s10664-017-9517-1. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-017-9517-1>. [2.4.1](#), [3.6.1](#), [4.1](#), [5.1](#), [5.1.2](#)
- [64] Marian Harbach, Markus Hettig, Susanne Weber, and Matthew Smith. Using personal examples to improve risk communication for security & privacy decisions. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, apr 2014. doi: 10.1145/2556288.2556978. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2556288.2556978>. [5.4.4](#)
- [65] Kamala D. Harris. Privacy on the go, recommendations for the mobile ecosystem. Available at https://oag.ca/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/privacy/privacy_on_the_go.pdf (2017/05/14), 2013. [2.4.2](#)
- [66] Sandra G. Hart and Lowell E. Staveland. Development of NASA-TLX (task load index): Results of empirical and theoretical research. In *Advances in Psychology*, pages 139–183. Elsevier, 1988. doi: 10.1016/s0166-4115(08)62386-9. URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0166-4115\(08\)62386-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0166-4115(08)62386-9). [5.3.3](#), [5.3.5](#)
- [67] David Hovemeyer and William Pugh. Finding bugs is easy. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, 39(12):92, dec 2004. doi: 10.1145/1052883.1052895. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1052883.1052895>. [2.4.2](#)
- [68] Jianjun Huang, Zhichun Li, Xusheng Xiao, Zhenyu Wu, Kangjie Lu, Xiangyu Zhang, and Guofei Jiang. Supor: Precise and scalable sensitive user input detection for android apps. In *24th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 15)*, pages 977–992, 2015. [5.2.3](#)
- [69] Luigi Lo Iacono and Peter Leo Gorski. I do and i understand. not yet true for security APIs. so sad. In *Proceedings 2nd European Workshop on Usable Security*. Internet Society, 2017. doi: 10.14722/eurousec.2017.23015. URL <https://doi.org/10.14722/eurousec.2017.23015>.

[europsec.2017.23015](#). 2.4.1, 4.1

- [70] Shubham Jain and Janne Lindqvist. Should i protect you? understanding developers' behavior to privacy-preserving APIs. In *Proceedings 2014 Workshop on Usable Security*. Internet Society, 2014. doi: 10.14722/usec.2014.23045. URL <https://doi.org/10.14722/usec.2014.23045>. 4.1
- [71] Carlos Jensen and Colin Potts. Privacy policies as decision-making tools: an evaluation of online privacy notices. In *Proceedings of the 2004 conference on Human factors in computing systems - CHI '04*. ACM Press, 2004. doi: 10.1145/985692.985752. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/985692.985752>. 2.2.1
- [72] Haojian Jin, Minyi Liu, Kevan Dodhia, Yuanchun Li, Gaurav Srivastava, Matthew Fredrikson, Yuvraj Agarwal, and Jason I Hong. Why are they collecting my data? inferring the purposes of network traffic in mobile apps. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies*, 2(4):1–27, 2018. 2.2.2
- [73] Haojian Jin, Minyi Liu, Kevan Dodhia, Yuanchun Li, Gaurav Srivastava, Matthew Fredrikson, Yuvraj Agarwal, and Jason I. Hong. "why are they collecting my data?": Inferring the purposes of network traffic in mobile apps. *Proc. ACM Interact. Mob. Wearable Ubiquitous Technol.*, 2018. 4.2.2
- [74] Brittany Johnson, Yoonki Song, Emerson Murphy-Hill, and Robert Bowdidge. Why don't software developers use static analysis tools to find bugs? In *2013 35th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, may 2013. doi: 10.1109/icse.2013.6606613. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/icse.2013.6606613>. 2.4.1, 2.4.2
- [75] Ruogu Kang, Laura Dabbish, Nathaniel Fruchter, and Sara Kiesler. {"My} data just goes {Everywhere:"} user mental models of the internet and implications for privacy and security. In *Eleventh Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security (SOUPS 2015)*, pages 39–52, 2015. 2.1.1, 2.1.2
- [76] Farzaneh Karegar, John Sören Pettersson, and Simone Fischer-Hübner. The dilemma of user engagement in privacy notices: Effects of interaction modes and habituation on user attention. *ACM Transactions on Privacy and Security*, 23(1):1–38, feb 2020. doi: 10.1145/3372296. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3372296>. 2.2.1
- [77] G. Karjoh and M. Schunter. A privacy policy model for enterprises. In *Proceedings 15th IEEE Computer Security Foundations Workshop. CSFW-15*. IEEE Comput. Soc. doi: 10.1109/csfw.2002.1021821. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/csfw.2002.1021821>. 4.2.2
- [78] Patrick Gage Kelley, Joanna Bresee, Lorrie Faith Cranor, and Robert W. Reeder. A "nutrition label" for privacy. In *Proceedings of the 5th Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security - SOUPS '09*. ACM Press, 2009. doi: 10.1145/1572532.1572538. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1572532.1572538>. 2.2.1, 2.3.3
- [79] Patrick Gage Kelley, Lucian Cesca, Joanna Bresee, and Lorrie Faith Cranor. Standardizing privacy notices: an online study of the nutrition label approach. In *Proceedings of the 28th international conference on Human factors in computing systems - CHI '10*. ACM

- Press, 2010. doi: 10.1145/1753326.1753561. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1753326.1753561>. 2.2.1
- [80] Patrick Gage Kelley, Lorrie Faith Cranor, and Norman Sadeh. Privacy as part of the app decision-making process. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, apr 2013. doi: 10.1145/2470654.2466466. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2470654.2466466>. 2.2.1, 2.3.3
- [81] Amy J. Ko and Brad A. Myers. Designing the whyline. In *Proceedings of the 2004 conference on Human factors in computing systems - CHI '04*. ACM Press, 2004. doi: 10.1145/985692.985712. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/985692.985712>. 4.5.4
- [82] Spyros Kokolakis. Privacy attitudes and privacy behaviour: A review of current research on the privacy paradox phenomenon. *Computers & security*, 64:122–134, 2017. 2.1.2
- [83] Isadora Krsek, Kimi V Wenzel, Sauvik Das, Jason I Hong, and Laura A Dabbish. To self-persuade or be persuaded: Examining interventions for users' privacy setting selection. 2022. 2.1.3
- [84] Li Li, Alexandre Bartel, Jacques Klein, Yves Le Traon, Steven Arzt, Siegfried Rasthofer, Eric Bodden, Damien Octeau, and Patrick McDaniel. I know what leaked in your pocket: uncovering privacy leaks on android apps with static taint analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.7431*, 2014. 2.4.2
- [85] Tianshi Li, Yuvraj Agarwal, and Jason I. Hong. Coconut: An ide plugin for developing privacy-friendly apps. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies*, 2(4):1–35, dec 2018. doi: 10.1145/3287056. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3287056>. 1, 1.1, 1.1, 1.2, 2.2.1, 2.4.2, 2.4.2, 3, 3.1, 3.6.1, 3.6.1, 3.6.1, 3.6.2, 3.6.3, 3.6.3, 5.1, 5.1.2, 5.2, 5.2.3, 5.2.4, 5.4.1, 5.4.3, 6.1
- [86] Tianshi Li, Cori Faklaris, Jennifer King, Yuvraj Agarwal, Laura Dabbish, Jason I Hong, et al. Decentralized is not risk-free: Understanding public perceptions of privacy-utility trade-offs in covid-19 contact-tracing apps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.11957*, 2020. 2.1.2
- [87] Tianshi Li, Camille Cobb, Jackie Junrui Yang, Sagar Baviskar, Yuvraj Agarwal, Beibei Li, Lujo Bauer, and Jason I Hong. What makes people install a covid-19 contact-tracing app? understanding the influence of app design and individual difference on contact-tracing app adoption intention. *Pervasive and Mobile Computing*, 75:101439, 2021. 2.1.2
- [88] Tianshi Li, Elizabeth Louie, Laura Dabbish, and Jason I. Hong. How developers talk about personal data and what it means for user privacy: A case study of a developer forum on reddit. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 4(CSCW3):1–28, jan 2021. doi: 10.1145/3432919. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3432919>. 1, 1.1, 3, 3.6.3, 3.6.3, 3.6.3, 5.1, 5.1.1, 5.1.2, 5.4.2
- [89] Tianshi Li, Elizabeth Louie, Laura Dabbish, and Jason I. Hong. How developers talk about personal data and what it means for user privacy: A case study of a developer forum on reddit. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 4(CSCW3):1–28, jan 2021. doi: 10.1145/3432919. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3432919>. 1.2
- [90] Tianshi Li, Elijah B. Neundorfer, Yuvraj Agarwal, and Jason I. Hong. Honeysuckle:

- Annotation-guided code generation of in-app privacy notices. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies*, 5(3):1–27, sep 2021. doi: 10.1145/3478097. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3478097>. 1, 1.1, 1.2, 2.1.3, 2.2.1, 2.2.1, 3.6.2, 6.1
- [91] Tianshi Li, Kayla Reiman, Yuvraj Agarwal, Lorrie Faith Cranor, and Jason I Hong. Understanding challenges for developers to create accurate privacy nutrition labels. *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 2022. 1, 1.2, 2.2.1, 3, 3.6.1, 3.6.1, 3.6.2, 3.6.2, 3.6.2, 6.1, 6.3
- [92] Yuanchun Li, Fanglin Chen, Toby Jia-Jun Li, Yao Guo, Gang Huang, Matthew Fredrikson, Yuvraj Agarwal, and Jason I. Hong. PrivacyStreams: Enabling transparency in personal data processing for mobile apps. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies*, 1(3):1–26, sep 2017. doi: 10.1145/3130941. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3130941>. 2.4.2, 3.6.3, 4.1, 4.2.2
- [93] Yucheng Li, Deyuan Chen, Tianshi Li, Yuvraj, Lorrie Faith Cranor, and Jason I Hong. Understanding ios privacy nutrition labels: An exploratory large-scale analysis of app store data. 2022. 1.2, 2.2.1, 3.6.2, 6.1
- [94] Jialiu Lin, Norman Sadeh, Shahriyar Amini, Janne Lindqvist, Jason I. Hong, and Joy Zhang. Expectation and purpose: understanding users' mental models of mobile app privacy through crowdsourcing. In *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM Conference on Ubiquitous Computing - UbiComp '12*. ACM Press, 2012. doi: 10.1145/2370216.2370290. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2370216.2370290>. 2.1.1, 2.1.3, 2.2.1, 5.1.1, 5.2, 5.2.1, 5.4.2
- [95] Jialiu Lin, Bin Liu, Norman Sadeh, and Jason I Hong. Modeling users' mobile app privacy preferences: Restoring usability in a sea of permission settings. In *10th Symposium On Usable Privacy and Security (SOUPS 2014)*, pages 199–212, 2014. 2.1.3, 2.2.1
- [96] Bin Liu, Mads Schaerup Andersen, Florian Schaub, Hazim Almuhimedi, Shikun Aerin Zhang, Norman Sadeh, Yuvraj Agarwal, and Alessandro Acquisti. Follow my recommendations: A personalized privacy assistant for mobile app permissions. In *Twelfth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security (SOUPS 2016)*, pages 27–41, 2016. 2.2.1
- [97] Michael Xieyang Liu, Jane Hsieh, Nathan Hahn, Angelina Zhou, Emily Deng, Shaun Burley, Cynthia Taylor, Aniket Kittur, and Brad A. Myers. Unakite: Scaffolding developers' decision-making using the web. In *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*. ACM, oct 2019. doi: 10.1145/3332165.3347908. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3332165.3347908>. 5.1.2
- [98] Xueqing Liu, Yue Leng, Wei Yang, Wenyu Wang, Chengxiang Zhai, and Tao Xie. A large-scale empirical study on android runtime-permission rationale messages. In *2018 IEEE Symposium on Visual Languages and Human-Centric Computing (VL/HCC)*. IEEE, oct 2018. doi: 10.1109/vlhcc.2018.8506574. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/vlhcc.2018.8506574>. 2.1.3, 5.1, 5.1.2, 5.2.3
- [99] Kai-Uwe Loser and Martin Degeling. Security and privacy as hygiene factors of developer behavior in small and agile teams. In *IFIP Advances in Information and Communica-*

tion Technology, pages 255–265. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2014. doi: 10.1007/978-3-662-44208-1_21. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-44208-1_21. 2.4.1, 4.1

- [100] Kangjie Lu, Zhichun Li, Vasileios P. Kemerlis, Zhenyu Wu, Long Lu, Cong Zheng, Zhiyun Qian, Wenke Lee, and Guofei Jiang. Checking more and alerting less: Detecting privacy leakages via enhanced data-flow analysis and peer voting. In *Proceedings 2015 Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*. Internet Society, 2015. doi: 10.14722/ndss.2015.23287. URL <https://doi.org/10.14722/ndss.2015.23287>. 5.2.1
- [101] Long Lu, Zhichun Li, Zhenyu Wu, Wenke Lee, and Guofei Jiang. CHEX. In *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM conference on Computer and communications security - CCS '12*. ACM Press, 2012. doi: 10.1145/2382196.2382223. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2382196.2382223>. 4.1
- [102] Stephen McCamant and Michael D Ernst. Quantitative information-flow tracking for c and related languages. 2006. 2.4.2
- [103] Aleecia M McDonald and Lorrie Faith Cranor. The cost of reading privacy policies. *I/S: A Journal of Law and Policy for the Information Society*, 4:543, 2008. 2.1.3, 2.2.1, 2.2.1
- [104] Aleecia M McDonald and Lorrie Faith Cranor. Americans’ attitudes about internet behavioral advertising practices. In *Proceedings of the 9th annual ACM workshop on Privacy in the electronic society*, pages 63–72, 2010. 2.1.2
- [105] Gerrit Meixner, Fabio Paternò, and Jean Vanderdonckt. Past, present, and future of model-based user interface development. *icom*, 10(3):2–11, nov 2011. doi: 10.1524/icom.2011.0026. URL <https://doi.org/10.1524/icom.2011.0026>. 5.4.1
- [106] Abraham H. Mhaidli, Yixin Zou, and Florian Schaub. “we can’t live without them!” app developers’ adoption of ad networks and their considerations of consumer risks. SOUPS’19, page 225–244, USA, 2019. USENIX Association. ISBN 9781939133052. 3.6.1
- [107] Victor Morel and Raúl Pardo. Sok: Three facets of privacy policies. In *Proceedings of the 19th Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society*, pages 41–56, 2020. 2.2.1
- [108] Andreas Mueller, Peter Forbrig, and Clemens Cap. Model-based user interface design using markup concepts. In *Interactive Systems: Design, Specification, and Verification*, pages 16–27. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2001. doi: 10.1007/3-540-45522-1_2. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45522-1_2. 5.1.1
- [109] Brad A Myers, Amy J Ko, Thomas D LaToza, and YoungSeok Yoon. Programmers are users too: Human-centered methods for improving programming tools. *Computer*, 49(7):44–52, 2016. 1, 2.4
- [110] James Newsome and Dawn Song. Dynamic taint analysis for automatic detection, analysis, and signature generation of exploits on commodity software. 2005. 2.4.2
- [111] Duc Cuong Nguyen, Dominik Wermke, Yasemin Acar, Michael Backes, Charles Weir, and Sascha Fahl. A stitch in time: Supporting android developers in writingsecure code.

- In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. ACM, oct 2017. doi: 10.1145/3133956.3133977. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3133956.3133977>. 2.4.2, 4.1
- [112] Trung Tin Nguyen, Michael Backes, Ninja Marnau, and Ben Stock. Share first, ask later (or never?) studying violations of {GDPR's} explicit consent in android apps. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pages 3667–3684, 2021. 2.3.1
 - [113] Helen Nissenbaum. Privacy as contextual integrity. *Wash. L. Rev.*, 79:119, 2004. 2.1.1
 - [114] Midas Nouwens, Ilaria Liccardi, Michael Veale, David Karger, and Lalana Kagal. Dark patterns after the GDPR: Scraping consent pop-ups and demonstrating their influence. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, apr 2020. doi: 10.1145/3313831.3376321. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376321>. 2.3.1, 5.1
 - [115] Damien Octeau, Patrick McDaniel, Somesh Jha, Alexandre Bartel, Eric Bodden, Jacques Klein, and Yves Le Traon. Effective inter-component communication mapping in android with epicc: An essential step towards holistic security analysis. In *Proceedings of the 22nd USENIX security symposium*, pages 543–558, 2013. 2.4.2
 - [116] Future of Privacy Forum and the Center for Democracy & Technology. Best practices for mobile application developers. Available at <https://www.cdt.org/files/pdfs/Best-Practices-Mobile-App-Developers.pdf> (2017/05/14), 2012. 2.4.2
 - [117] Office of the Australian Information Commissioner. Mobile privacy: a better practice guide for mobile app developers. Available at <https://www.oaic.gov.au/agencies-and-organisations/guides/guide-for-mobile-app-developers> (2017/05/14), 2014. 2.4.2
 - [118] Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada. Seizing opportunity: Good privacy practices for developing mobile apps. Available at https://www.priv.gc.ca/en/privacy-topics/technology-and-privacy/mobile-devices-and-apps/gd_app_201210/ (2017/05/14), 2012. 2.4.2
 - [119] Information Commissioner's Office. Privacy in mobile apps, guidance for app developers. Available at <https://ico.org.uk/media/for-organisations/documents/1596/privacy-in-mobile-apps-dp-guidance.pdf> (2017/05/14), 2013. 2.4.2
 - [120] Cheul Young Park, Cori Faklaris, Siyan Zhao, Alex Sciuto, Laura Dabbish, and Jason Hong. Share and share alike? an exploration of secure behaviors in romantic relationships. In *Fourteenth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security ({SOUPS} 2018)*, pages 83–102, 2018. 1
 - [121] Article 29 Data Protection Working Party. Opinion 02/2013 on apps on smart devices. Available at http://ec.europa.eu/justice/data-protection/article-29/documentation/opinion-recommendation/files/2013/wp202_en.pdf (2017/05/14), 2013. 2.4.2
 - [122] Dev Patnaik and Robert Becker. Needfinding: the why and how of uncovering people's

needs. *Design Management Journal (Former Series)*, 10(2):37–43, 1999. 3

- [123] Feng Qin, Cheng Wang, Zhenmin Li, Ho seop Kim, Yuanyuan Zhou, and Youfeng Wu. LIFT: A low-overhead practical information flow tracking system for detecting security attacks. In *2006 39th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO'06)*. IEEE, dec 2006. doi: 10.1109/micro.2006.29. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/micro.2006.29>. 2.4.2
- [124] Ashwini Rao, Florian Schaub, Norman Sadeh, Alessandro Acquisti, and Ruogu Kang. Expecting the unexpected: Understanding mismatched privacy expectations online. In *Twelfth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security (SOUPS 2016)*, pages 77–96, 2016. 2.2.1, 5.2.1
- [125] Siegfried Rasthofer, Steven Arzt, and Eric Bodden. A machine-learning approach for classifying and categorizing android sources and sinks. In *Proceedings 2014 Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*. Internet Society, 2014. doi: 10.14722/ndss.2014.23039. URL <https://doi.org/10.14722/ndss.2014.23039>. 5.4.3
- [126] Jingjing Ren, Ashwin Rao, Martina Lindorfer, Arnaud Legout, and David Choffnes. Re-Con: Revealing and controlling pii leaks in mobile network traffic. In *Proceedings of the 14th Annual International Conference on Mobile Systems, Applications, and Services*. ACM, jun 2016. doi: 10.1145/2906388.2906392. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2906388.2906392>. 2.2.2
- [127] Franziska Roesner, Tadayoshi Kohno, and David Wetherall. Detecting and defending against {Third-Party} tracking on the web. In *9th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 12)*, pages 155–168, 2012. 2.2.2
- [128] Caitlin Sadowski, Jeffrey van Gogh, Ciera Jaspan, Emma Soderberg, and Collin Winter. Tricorder: Building a program analysis ecosystem. In *2015 IEEE/ACM 37th IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering*. IEEE, may 2015. doi: 10.1109/icse.2015.76. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/icse.2015.76>. 2.4.1, 2.4.2
- [129] Shruti Sannon, Natalya N Bazarova, and Dan Cosley. Privacy lies: Understanding how, when, and why people lie to protect their privacy in multiple online contexts. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–13, 2018. 2.1.2
- [130] Florian Schaub, Rebecca Balebako, Adam L. Durity, and Lorrie Faith Cranor. A design space for effective privacy notices. In *Eleventh Symposium On Usable Privacy and Security (SOUPS 2015)*, pages 1–17, Ottawa, July 2015. USENIX Association. ISBN 978-1-931971-24-9. URL <https://www.usenix.org/conference/soups2015/proceedings/presentation/schaub>. 2.2.1, 2.2.1, 5.1, 5.1.1, 5.1.2, 5.2.1, 5.2.1
- [131] Florian Schaub, Rebecca Balebako, and Lorrie Faith Cranor. Designing effective privacy notices and controls. *IEEE Internet Computing*, pages 1–1, 2017. doi: 10.1109/mic.2017.265102930. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/mic.2017.265102930>. 2.2.1
- [132] Shayak Sen, Saikat Guha, Anupam Datta, Sriram K. Rajamani, Janice Tsai, and Jean-

- nette M. Wing. Bootstrapping privacy compliance in big data systems. In *2014 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*. IEEE, may 2014. doi: 10.1109/sp.2014.28. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/sp.2014.28>. 2.4.2
- [133] Swapneel Sheth, Gail Kaiser, and Walid Maalej. Us and them: a study of privacy requirements across north america, asia, and europe. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Software Engineering*. ACM, may 2014. doi: 10.1145/2568225.2568244. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2568225.2568244>. 2.4.1, 3.6.1, 5.1, 5.1.2
- [134] Irina Shklovski, Scott D Mainwaring, Halla Hrund Skúladóttir, and Höskuldur Borgthorsson. Leakiness and creepiness in app space: Perceptions of privacy and mobile app use. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 2347–2356, 2014. 2.1.1
- [135] Justin Smith, Brittany Johnson, Emerson Murphy-Hill, Bill Chu, and Heather Richter Lipford. Questions developers ask while diagnosing potential security vulnerabilities with static analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2015 10th Joint Meeting on Foundations of Software Engineering - ESEC/FSE 2015*. ACM Press, 2015. doi: 10.1145/2786805.2786812. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2786805.2786812>. 2.4.1
- [136] Sooel Son, Kathryn S. McKinley, and Vitaly Shmatikov. RoleCast. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, 46(10):1069, oct 2011. doi: 10.1145/2076021.2048146. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2076021.2048146>. 4.1
- [137] Yihang Song and Urs Hengartner. PrivacyGuard: A vpn-based platform to detect information leakage on android devices. In *Proceedings of the 5th Annual ACM CCS Workshop on Security and Privacy in Smartphones and Mobile Devices*. ACM, oct 2015. doi: 10.1145/2808117.2808120. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2808117.2808120>. 2.2.2
- [138] Yunpeng Song, Cori Faklaris, Zhongmin Cai, Jason I Hong, and Laura Dabbish. Normal and easy: Account sharing practices in the workplace. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 3(CSCW):1–25, 2019. 1
- [139] Gaurav Srivastava, Kunal Bhuwalka, Swarup Kumar Sahoo, Saksham Chitkara, Kevin Ku, Matt Fredrikson, Jason Hong, and Yuvraj Agarwal. Privacyproxy: Leveraging crowdsourcing and in situ traffic analysis to detect and mitigate information leakage. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.06384*, 2017. 2.2.2, 5.1, 5.1.2
- [140] FTC Staff. Protecting consumer privacy in an era of rapid change—a proposed framework for businesses and policymakers. *Journal of Privacy and Confidentiality*, jun 2011. doi: 10.29012/jpc.v3i1.596. URL <https://doi.org/10.29012/jpc.v3i1.596>. 2.2.1
- [141] Ryan Stevens, Clint Gibler, Jon Crussell, Jeremy Erickson, and Hao Chen. Investigating user privacy in android ad libraries. In *Workshop on Mobile Security Technologies (MoST)*, volume 10. Citeseer, 2012. 5.2.1
- [142] Noi Sukaviriya, Srdjan Kovacevic, James D. Foley, Brad A. Myers, Dan R. Olsen, and Matthias Schneider-Hufschmidt. Model-based user interfaces: what are they and why should we care? In *Proceedings of the 7th annual ACM symposium on User interface software and technology - UIST '94*. ACM Press, 1994. doi: 10.1145/192426.192479. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/192426.192479>. 5.4.1

- [143] Mohammad Tahaei, Kami Vaniea, and Naomi Saphra. Understanding privacy-related questions on stack overflow. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, apr 2020. doi: 10.1145/3313831.3376768. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376768>. 3.6.3
- [144] Mohammad Tahaei, Kami Vaniea, and Naomi Saphra. *Understanding Privacy-Related Questions on Stack Overflow*, page 1–14. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2020. ISBN 9781450367080. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376768>. 3.6.3
- [145] Mohammad Tahaei, Tianshi Li, and Kami Vaniea. Understanding privacy-related advice on stack overflow. In *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, pages 1—18, 2022. doi: 10.2478/popets-2022-0032. 1, 3, 3.6.2, 3.6.3
- [146] Mohammad Tahaei, Kopo M. Ramokapane, Tianshi Li, Jason I. Hong, and Awais Rashid. Charting app developers’ journey through privacy regulation features in ad networks. In *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, pages 1—24, 2022. 1, 3, 3.6.1
- [147] Joshua Tan, Khanh Nguyen, Michael Theodorides, Heidi Negrón-Arroyo, Christopher Thompson, Serge Egelman, and David Wagner. The effect of developer-specified explanations for permission requests on smartphone user behavior. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, apr 2014. doi: 10.1145/2556288.2557400. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2556288.2557400>. 5.1.1, 5.2.1
- [148] National Telecommunications and Information Administration. Short form notice code of conduct to promote transparency in mobile app practices. Available at https://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/publications/july_25_code_draft.pdf (2017/05/14), 2013. 2.4.2
- [149] Tyler W. Thomas, Madiha Tabassum, Bill Chu, and Heather Lipford. Security during application development. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - CHI '18*. ACM Press, 2018. doi: 10.1145/3173574.3173836. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3173574.3173836>. 2.4.2
- [150] Haoyu Wang, Yuanchun Li, Yao Guo, Yuvraj Agarwal, and Jason I Hong. Understanding the purpose of permission use in mobile apps. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)*, 35(4):1–40, 2017. 2.2.2
- [151] Yang Wang, Gregory Norcie, Saranga Komanduri, Alessandro Acquisti, Pedro Giovanni Leon, and Lorrie Faith Cranor. ” i regretted the minute i pressed share” a qualitative study of regrets on facebook. In *Proceedings of the seventh symposium on usable privacy and security*, pages 1–16, 2011. 1
- [152] Chamila Wijayarathna, Nalin A. G. Arachchilage, and Jill Slay. A generic cognitive dimensions questionnaire to evaluate the usability of security APIs. In *Human Aspects of Information Security, Privacy and Trust*, pages 160–173. Springer International Publishing, 2017. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-58460-7_11. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-58460-7_11. 2.4.1
- [153] Primal Wijesekera, Joel Reardon, Irwin Reyes, Lynn Tsai, Jung-Wei Chen, Nathan Good,

- David Wagner, Konstantin Beznosov, and Serge Egelman. Contextualizing privacy decisions for better prediction (and protection). In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, apr 2018. doi: 10.1145/3173574.3173842. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3173574.3173842>. 5.1, 5.1.1, 5.2.1
- [154] Jim Witschey, Olga Zielinska, Allaire Welk, Emerson Murphy-Hill, Chris Mayhorn, and Thomas Zimmermann. Quantifying developers' adoption of security tools. In *Proceedings of the 2015 10th Joint Meeting on Foundations of Software Engineering - ESEC/FSE 2015*. ACM Press, 2015. doi: 10.1145/2786805.2786816. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2786805.2786816>. 2.4.1, 2.4.2
- [155] Shundan Xiao, Jim Witschey, and Emerson Murphy-Hill. Social influences on secure development tool adoption. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work & social computing - CSCW '14*. ACM Press, 2014. doi: 10.1145/2531602.2531722. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2531602.2531722>. 2.4.1, 2.4.2
- [156] Jing Xie, H. R. Lipford, and Bill Chu. Why do programmers make security errors? In *2011 IEEE Symposium on Visual Languages and Human-Centric Computing (VL/HCC)*. IEEE, sep 2011. doi: 10.1109/vlhcc.2011.6070393. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/vlhcc.2011.6070393>. 2.4.1, 2.4.2
- [157] Jing Xie, Heather Lipford, and Bei-Tseng Chu. Evaluating interactive support for secure programming. In *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM annual conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - CHI '12*. ACM Press, 2012. doi: 10.1145/2207676.2208665. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2207676.2208665>. 2.4.2, 4.1
- [158] Jean Yang, Kuat Yessenov, and Armando Solar-Lezama. A language for automatically enforcing privacy policies. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, 47(1):85, jan 2012. doi: 10.1145/2103621.2103669. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2103621.2103669>. 2.4.2
- [159] Jean Yang, Travis Hance, Thomas H. Austin, Armando Solar-Lezama, Cormac Flanagan, and Stephen Chong. Precise, dynamic information flow for database-backed applications. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, 51(6):631–647, jun 2016. doi: 10.1145/2980983.2908098. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2980983.2908098>. 2.4.2
- [160] Jinyan Zang, Krysta Dummit, James Graves, Paul Lisker, and Latanya Sweeney. Who knows what about me? a survey of behind the scenes personal data sharing to third parties by mobile apps. *Technology Science*, 30, 2015. 4.1
- [161] Sebastian Zimmeck, Ziqi Wang, Lieyong Zou, Roger Iyengar, Bin Liu, Florian Schaub, Shomir Wilson, Norman Sadeh, Steven M. Bellovin, and Joel Reidenberg. Automated analysis of privacy requirements for mobile apps. In *Proceedings 2017 Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*. Internet Society, 2017. doi: 10.14722/ndss.2017.23034. URL <https://doi.org/10.14722/ndss.2017.23034>. 2.1.3