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Abstract—
Lawmakers worldwide [1]–[7] have taken notice of “dark patterns:” design practices that “[deceive, manipulate, or otherwise distort with technology users’ ability to make informed decisions].” [2] HCI scholarship has revealed dark patterns’ pervasiveness [8], [9] in ubiquitous [10]–[16] and emergent technologies [17], users’ opinions of dark patterns [10], [11], [18]–[20], and dark patterns in contexts like consent and privacy [19]–[27]. Critics, however, allege that the term (in law) is overbroad, impractical, and counterproductive insofar as it applies to normative, “omnipresent” design practices [28].

Established legal frameworks prohibit wrongful self-dealing in fields like finance (e.g., fiduciary duty) and medicine (e.g., “do no harm”). Scholars suggesting similar frameworks for privacy and technology like a “duty of loyalty for privacy law, [29]” in which platforms should act in the best privacy interests of end users. In this research proposal we explore a loyalty framework for dark patterns and design from interdisciplinary CS and law perspectives.

1. Motivation

Inter- and Cross-disciplinary Dark Patterns Scholarship. In both computer science and law disciplines, scholars discuss implications of their field’s findings for the other’s use [30], [31]. A growing body of collaborative scholarship across these disciplines explore dark patterns in accordance to extant regulations like the GDPR [22], as well as potential avenues for regulating dark patterns in practice [32], [33].

Asymptotes for Harms Approaches. Though prior taxonomies have robustly considered dark patterns harms [31] and design values [8], the question of how to best measure dark patterns harms remains unanswered. The law often requires proof and/or severity thresholds of harm in order to remedy issues, but dark patterns need not result in unavoidable or proven harms to be risky or problematic user designs. What should be done about disadvantaged designs, or designs that may cause harm in aggregate but individually present as harmless or de minimus (or otherwise below-threshold) harms? Harms approaches to dark patterns may only go so far, so we then turn to consumer-protective theories that rely less heavily on them.

Borrowing from Privacy Studies (and Other Legal Subfields). Dark patterns scholarship has often focused on privacy [19]–[23], [26], and new global privacy regulations [3], [4], [34], [35] (which include guidelines for technology and data practices writ large) have rapidly emerged in the past decade. From this momentum, privacy provides an case study by which to expand consumer protections overall.

We focus on a duty of loyalty for privacy law [29] as initial motivation for this work. Duties of care and loyalty are essentially end-user protections, for specific subgroups of users. Thus we are interested in understanding why other subfields follow loyalty principles closely and why privacy or technology have yet to adopt them. Next, if loyalty minimizes harms and maximizes benefits, privacy offers other inspiration through data minimization. Prior work [13] suggests “design appropriateness” (inspired by data minimization, and meant to minimize “nagging” or redundant designs that may detract from UX quality) to reduce dark patterns in user interfaces.

2. Towards Design Loyalty and Appropriateness: Provocations

We intend to explore the operability of a duty of loyalty (and design appropriateness) for user experiences and thus dark patterns. Specifically, we ask the following questions:

- Is design loyalty potentially feasible as a consumer protection measure against dark patterns and related UX issues? Why or why not, and what evidence suggests feasibility or lack thereof?
- Are there unique traits in digital consumer protections or design (as compared to fields traditionally employing care and loyalty duties, like medicine and finance) that impact design loyalty implementations?
- If harm is centralizing factor for duties of care and loyalty in other disciplines, what makes harms approaches more difficult for digital experiences?
• To what extent does industry self-governed ethical or value-sensitive UX achieve the goals of design loyalty? What operational or technical mechanisms might a legal approach to design loyalty help mandate?

• Can designs be effectively “minimized” in a similar manner to data minimization? What consequences would such an approach lead to?

Answering such questions, we believe, requires stakeholders from both quantitative and qualitative CS scholarship, as well as from law and other disciplines. Thus we present the concept of design loyalty as a provocation to the ConPro’24 community in the hopes of fostering discussion and future work.
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