Embodied Consent Interfaces: A Design Probe for Privacy Decision-Making in Virtual Reality

Viktorija Paneva
LMU Munich
Munich, Germany
viktorija.paneva@ifi.lmu.de

Yilin Ma
LMU Munich
Munich, Germany
yil.ma@campus.lmu.de

Florian Alt
LMU Munich
Munich, Germany
University of the Bundeswehr Munich
Munich, Germany
florian.alt@ifi.lmu.de

Figure 1: *What if privacy consent was something you had to perform, not click?* In an *Embodied Consent Interface (ECI)*, users grant permissions through embodied action: exploring and revising consent choices (left), and committing through deliberate interaction (right). This interaction sequence reflects key characteristics of ECIs: consent is enacted through embodied engagement, unfolds over time as a revisable process, and incorporates an explicit act of deliberate commitment.

Abstract

We introduce *Embodied Consent Interfaces (ECIs)* as a design probe for rethinking privacy consent beyond dialog-window-based notice-and-choice consent mechanisms. ECIs reframe privacy consent as an embodied, performative process in which users engage with permissions through spatial interaction, ongoing revision, and a deliberate act of commitment. We present a functional ECI prototype in Virtual Reality (VR), where data types are represented as interactive 3D objects, enabling users to explore permission information and select, revoke, or revise their consent decisions through embodied interaction. In an exploratory within-subject study (N = 12), we compare this approach to a dialog-based permission interface. Qualitative findings suggest increased engagement and more cautious consent behavior, while also introducing additional interaction overhead. Finally, we discuss ECIs as a design probe to introduce intentional friction at privacy-critical moments and to explore trade-offs between deliberation and efficiency in consent interaction design.

CCS Concepts

• **Human-centered computing** → **VR**; • **Security and privacy** → **Usability in security and privacy**.

Keywords

Usable Privacy, Virtual Reality (VR), Privacy Permissions, Embodiment, Interaction Design.

ACM Reference Format:
Viktorija Paneva, Yilin Ma, and Florian Alt. 2026. Embodied Consent Interfaces: A Design Probe for Privacy Decision-Making in Virtual Reality. In *Designing Interactive Systems Conference (DIS Companion '26), June 13–17, 2026, Singapore, Singapore.* ACM, New York, NY, USA, 5 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3802974.3809471

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
DIS Companion '26, Singapore, Singapore
© 2026 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).
ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-2632-3/26/06
https://doi.org/10.1145/3802974.3809471

1 Introduction

The most common approach for gathering consent today is notice-and-choice [20]. However, such mechanisms often suffer from poor usability: consent is usually front-loaded, reduced to binary choices, and important information is buried in lengthy legal text, resulting

in users providing consent without having a full understanding of the consequences of their privacy decisions [16, 23].

These challenges are particularly pronounced in head-mounted display (HMD)-based immersive environments, where arrays of (always-on) sensors operate in close proximity to the body and capture fine-grained user data. State-of-the-art headsets can collect behavioral data (e.g., hand and body motion, eye gaze), physiological data (e.g., electroencephalography, heart rate), contextual data (e.g., size of tracking space, bystanders), and device specifications [5, 12]. Such data can be used to make inferences about users' well-being, literacy, impairments, and even political views and gender [12, 21]. Prior work has further shown that it is possible to uniquely identify users using only VR movement data [13]. At the same time, users often lack awareness of the granularity of these sensing capabilities and the inferences that can be drawn from them [6].

As intelligent systems with continuous sensing capabilities become increasingly pervasive, privacy decision-making extends beyond isolated moments of disclosure and becomes intertwined with ongoing, contextual, and embodied interaction in everyday use [10, 15]. This shift raises new questions of how consent interactions should be designed for immersive environments.

In this paper, we explore *Embodied Consent Interfaces (ECIs)* as an alternative approach to designing for privacy consent in VR/XR. ECIs reframe privacy consent as an embodied, performative process, inviting users to engage with privacy decisions through exploration, revision, and deliberate commitment.

To investigate this approach, we develop a functional VR prototype of an ECI (see Figure 1). We use this prototype as a design probe to surface how embodied interaction introduces friction, shapes user engagement, and influences privacy decision-making, and to explore how such mechanisms inform the design of privacy consent in XR. We report findings from an exploratory within-subject study (N = 12) comparing this embodied approach to a traditional dialog-based permission interface. We conclude by discussing how ECIs can be used as a design probe to explore the design space of privacy consent in XR, particularly the trade-offs between deliberation and efficiency, and to investigate when embodied interaction may be appropriate in privacy-critical moments.

2 Background

Interaction in immersive environments is inherently embodied, shaping how users perceive, engage with, and make sense of digital experiences. Dourish argues that interaction is fundamentally embodied and situated, with meaning emerging through action rather than symbolic representation [4]. Prior work shows that embodied interaction in mixed reality can support learning and higher engagement with scientific content [8]. Beyond engagement, embodied interaction has also been explored as a means of supporting reflection, enabling users to become more aware of the situation and themselves [24]. Reflective interaction design emphasizes that interaction can be intentionally structured to slow down routine behavior and invite consideration, rather than merely optimizing for interface efficiency [2, 19].

Building on this perspective, a related line of research considers the role of friction in security and privacy interactions. Distler et al. propose *security-enhancing friction*, a deliberate introduction of negative user experience at security-critical moments, intended to reduce risk-taking behavior without compromising overall usability [3]. This work suggests that, particularly in high-stakes contexts, efficiency may not always be desirable; effort and deliberation may be needed to support users when making critical decisions.

In parallel, research on usable privacy in XR has begun to reconceptualize consent. As continuous, body-proximate sensing raises new challenges for awareness and control, consent is increasingly understood as an ongoing, contextual process that unfolds over time, rather than a single event or binary confirmation [10]. Relatedly, recent studies explored design concepts for improving data collection awareness and control in VR through participatory design, highlighting the need for consent mechanisms that better align with immersive contexts [17].

From a broader design perspective, feminist HCI emphasizes agency, embodiment, participation, and pluralism, arguing that interaction design should support user empowerment and negotiation [1]. Nguyen and Ruberg introduce the notion of *consent mechanics* in video games, demonstrating how interactive systems can structure how users express and negotiate consent [14]. Similarly, research on embodied consent frames consent as relational, revisable, and situated, rather than fixed or binary [22]. In the context of social VR, Schulenberg et al. show that users prefer flexible boundaries ("guardrails"), not rigid restrictions ("bird cages"), highlighting the need for dynamic and responsive consent models [18].

In sensor-rich environments such as HMD-based VR and XR, consent increasingly concerns high-stakes behavioral and physiological data captured via continuous, body-proximate sensing. Such data practices can be difficult for users to perceive or reason about through conventional dialog-based prompts, which continue to dominate privacy design. While prior work has conceptualized consent as embodied, ongoing, and interactional, these perspectives have rarely been translated into concrete interaction designs for privacy consent in immersive environments. As a result, consent remains largely implemented as an abstract, symbolic choice, despite growing recognition that it is inherently situated and embodied. This motivates exploring alternative consent mechanisms that make the act of providing privacy consent more tangible, invite reflection, and support more deliberative privacy decision-making through embodied interaction.

3 Embodied Consent Interfaces

We define *Embodied Consent Interfaces (ECIs)* as consent mechanisms in which privacy decisions are enacted through embodied, spatial action, allowing users to engage with permissions as interactive elements of the virtual (or real) environment. Beyond making permissions tangible, ECIs emphasize consent as a revisable process with an explicit moment of embodied commitment, rather than a one-time binary confirmation. Key design characteristics include:

Consent as embodied engagement. ECIs foreground embodied interaction as part of the consent process. Permissions are not merely read and accepted, but encountered through action—such as approaching, inspecting, or manipulating representations of data practices—shifting consent from symbolic agreement to situated engagement.

Consent as revisable process. Rather than treating consent as a one-time event, ECIs support provisional consent. Users can select, revoke, or modify decisions during interaction, reflecting the view that consent unfolds over time.

Consent as deliberate commitment. Finally, ECIs distinguish between exploration and commitment. By requiring an explicit embodied action to finalize permissions, ECIs introduce intentional friction at privacy-critical moments, encouraging active deliberation without necessarily optimizing for interface efficiency.

4 Exploratory Study

To explore how ECIs shape privacy decision-making, we conducted an exploratory within-subject study comparing our ECI prototype to a traditional dialog-based permission interface.

4.1 Prototype

We developed a functional VR prototype in Unity and conducted the study using a Meta Quest 3 HMD. In the embodied condition, permissions are represented as interactive objects (pizza ingredients) that users can inspect, select, revise, and commit to through a deliberate action—closing the oven door and turning the oven knob (see Figure 1).

We implemented two privacy permission interface conditions. The first condition served as a baseline and used a traditional, text-based dialog interface. Participants were presented with a short description and an "Allow/Deny" option for each permission, similar to the notice-and-choice mechanisms used in many commercial applications.

The second condition implemented an ECI using a pizza-making metaphor. We chose a familiar activity to make abstract data categories more accessible and to externalize otherwise invisible data collection practices. Privacy permissions were represented as virtual ingredients corresponding to different categories of user data (Video Data, Voice Data, Eye Tracking, Heart Rate, Motion Tracking, and Biometrics). Participants enacted their consent decisions through direct manipulation, by adding or abandoning ingredients on the pizza base. When a participant grabbed an ingredient, a panel appeared providing brief information about the data type and its collection purpose. To finalize their choices, participants placed the pizza in the oven and turned the knob, introducing an explicit moment of deliberate commitment. To isolate the effect of the interaction design, the explanation text was kept identical to that used in the baseline condition.

The prototype operationalizes the core characteristics of ECIs by enabling embodied engagement with permissions, supporting ongoing revision, and introducing an explicit act of commitment. Through this design, consent decisions are situated in three ways: (1) spatially, as permissions are encountered as manipulable objects; (2) temporally, as decisions unfold through sequential exploration and revision; and (3) interactionally, as choices emerge through embodied action rather than prior deliberation.

Additionally, we included a short interaction tutorial at the beginning of the study to familiarize participants with the environment and controller-based inputs, particularly for those with limited prior VR experience. Participants practiced assembling a pizza using regular ingredients (e.g., tomatoes, olives, salami) and performing basic movements and object manipulation, such as grabbing, placing, and removing items.

4.2 Study Procedure

After providing informed consent, participants completed a demographic questionnaire and the Internet Users' Information Privacy Concerns (IUIPC) scale [9] to establish baseline privacy attitudes.

Participants first completed a short interaction tutorial to familiarise themselves with the environment and controller-based inputs. Then they completed the two privacy permission interface conditions in a counterbalanced order.

In each condition, participants reviewed a set of six privacy permissions and made consent decisions for each data type. In the baseline condition, participants indicated their choices by selecting "Allow" or "Do Not Allow" in a standard permission dialog window. In the ECI condition, participants enacted their decisions through direct manipulation, adding ingredients corresponding to data types they agreed to share and abandoning those they did not.

After completing the two VR sessions, participants took part in a semi-structured interview. The interview focused on participants' overall experience with both interfaces and their perceptions of privacy decision-making.

4.3 Participants

We conducted an exploratory study with 12 participants (8 females, 4 males) aged 22-29 years ($M = 23.92$, $SD = 2.31$). All participants were university students. Overall, participants' previous VR experience, on a Likert 1-7 scale, was moderate ($M = 3.42$, $SD = 1.56$). Participants reported relatively high privacy concern across the IUIPC dimensions of *Awareness* ($M = 5.86, SD = 1.10$), *Control* ($M = 6.03, SD = 1.00$), and *Collection* ($M = 5.11, SD = 1.85$). The study lasted approximately 60 minutes, and participants received €12 as compensation.

4.4 Results

We analyzed the interview data using an inductive thematic approach and summarized interaction logs descriptively.

4.4.1 Qualitative Results. Participants described the dialog-based interface as familiar but unengaging. Several noted that this familiarity can encourage speed rather than reflection: the baseline was "clear and easy" but "nothing special" (P5), and felt "boring and ordinary," leading to impatience with reading details (P9). At the same time, some participants valued its simplicity: "You read it, and then you click it… easier to focus" (P8).

In contrast, the ECI prototype was described as "fun," "interesting," and "innovative" (P3, P4). One participant noted that it made them "more willing to read the information" (P9), while another described the environment as "vivid" and encouraging more conscious selection (P11). P3 further highlighted that the icons supported recognition when the text became difficult or tiresome to read.

However, participants also emphasized the additional effort introduced by the embodied approach. Some participants described the embodied approach as "mentally demanding" and requiring time to learn (P5), and noted that embodied interaction could lead

to accidental mistakes, such as dropping ingredients (P8). One participant further pointed to a potential tension between engagement and seriousness: while embodied interaction increased attention and engagement, it could also shift consent into the "game layer", making it easier for users to lose sight of the fact that they were managing "actual privacy settings" (P11).

Across participants, the most sensitive permissions were consistently associated with (a) microphone and voice data, due to concerns about AI voice cloning, vishing scams, and eavesdropping on private conversations (P5, P7, P11); (b) camera and video data, described as "too personal" and potentially revealing the home environment (P4, P10); and (c) biometric data, linked to fears of misuse in contexts such as online banking or facial identification (P3).

Finally, participants suggested refinements to improve usability and long-term adoption. These included simplifying interaction steps (especially for returning users) (P9, P12); providing a more rewarding sense of closure (e.g., a "final cooked pizza") (P5, P10); and clearly distinguishing necessary versus optional permissions in both interfaces (P9).

4.4.2 Interaction Logs. We analyzed interaction logs of participants' consent decisions across the six permission categories. Overall, participants granted fewer permissions in the embodied condition (69.5%) than in the baseline (77.8%). This difference was most pronounced for movement tracking, which was frequently allowed in the baseline condition (91.7%) but selected less often in the ECI condition (58.3%).

5 Discussion

Our exploratory findings suggest that ECIs offer a promising alternative lens on privacy consent in sensor-rich environments. Rather than optimizing for efficiency and minimal interruption, ECIs foreground consent as an embodied, revisable, and reflective process. At the same time, our study highlights important trade-offs and open questions for the future design of privacy consent interfaces.

Friction, Engagement, and the Cost of Deliberation. A central tension concerns the relationship between deliberation and usability. Participants described the baseline dialog interface as familiar and efficient, but also as easy to dismiss or "click through." In contrast, the embodied interface encouraged more active engagement and reflection, but required additional effort and time. This suggests that friction may be productive at privacy-critical moments, yet designers must carefully balance meaningful engagement with interaction overhead, particularly in everyday use.

At the same time, ECIs must balance immersion with seriousness. As prior work notes, playful metaphors can both clarify consent decisions and risk trivializing their consequences [17]. More broadly, interfaces in XR are shaped by the distinctive properties of immersive interaction, including spatial presentation, perceptual salience, and continuous device sensing. These characteristics can make the interaction feel more engaging, but may also introduce new opportunities for persuasive or potentially deceptive design [7, 11]. As immersive systems increasingly support hyperpersonalised experiences and blur physical and virtual boundaries, ensuring that consent remains transparent, interpretable, and trustworthy becomes an important design challenge.

ECIs as a Design Probe. We position ECIs not as a replacement for existing consent mechanisms, but as a design probe for exploring alternative approaches to privacy decision-making. By reframing consent as embodied action rather than symbolic interaction, ECIs invite reconsideration of how responsibility, commitment, and reversibility are communicated through interface design.

At the same time, embodied interaction may not always be desirable or scalable for frequent permission requests. Future systems may therefore need to combine embodied moments of commitment with delegated or adaptive consent models (e.g., through trusted agents, collaborative or distributed decision-making, or institutional safeguards), enabling users to meaningfully express their preferences without repeated burden. ECIs may be particularly valuable for surfacing deliberation on high-stakes, body-proximate data that might otherwise be easy to overlook.

Limitations and Future Work. As an initial exploration, our findings are based on a small, primarily student sample and short-term exposure to the prototype. While the study results indicate that ECIs can increase engagement and encourage more cautious consent behavior, it does not yet disentangle the mechanisms underlying these effects. Future work should more closely examine the relative contributions of embodied interaction, visual representation (e.g., icon-based elements), and potential novelty effects, and how these factors shape users' privacy decision-making processes.

The current prototype explores one concrete instantiation of ECIs through a familiar and accessible metaphor. While this design supports accessibility and interpretability, future work could investigate alternative metaphors, interaction techniques, and levels of abstraction in representing data practices to better understand how different representations influence user experience and consent decisions.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we explored ECIs as a design probe for rethinking privacy consent in XR beyond dialog-based notice-and-choice privacy consent mechanisms. Through a functional VR prototype and an exploratory user study, we examined how embodied interaction might shape users' engagement with privacy permissions. Our findings suggest that ECIs require deliberate effort that can support reflection, increase perceived control, and encourage more cautious consent behavior, albeit at the cost of loss of efficiency. We emphasize that this work is exploratory and positions ECIs not as a prescriptive solution but as a means to probe the design space of privacy consent in XR. In particular, ECIs help surface trade-offs between deliberation and efficiency, and highlight when embodied interaction may be appropriate in privacy or security-critical moments.

Future work could further investigate how ECIs support privacy decision-making by disentangling the roles of embodiment, visual representation, and potential novelty effects, and by exploring alternative metaphors, interaction techniques, and levels of abstraction for representing data practices. Additionally, future research could examine how ECIs might be adapted for different

contexts or support delegated consent models. As sensor-rich environments relying on continuous, body-proximate sensing continue to proliferate, we argue that rethinking privacy consent beyond the click remains an important and open design challenge.

Acknowledgments

This work has received funding from the German Research Foundation (DFG) under grant agreement no. 521584224.

References

[1] Shaowen Bardzell. 2010. Feminist HCI: taking stock and outlining an agenda for design. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Atlanta, Georgia, USA) *(CHI '10)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1301–1310. doi:10.1145/1753326.1753521

[2] Eric P.S. Baumer, Vera Khovanskaya, Mark Matthews, Lindsay Reynolds, Victoria Schwanda Sosik, and Geri Gay. 2014. Reviewing reflection: on the use of reflection in interactive system design. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Designing Interactive Systems* (Vancouver, BC, Canada) *(DIS '14)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 93–102. doi:10.1145/2598510.2598598

[3] Verena Distler, Gabriele Lenzini, Carine Lallemand, and Vincent Koenig. 2021. The Framework of Security-Enhancing Friction: How UX Can Help Users Behave More Securely. In *Proceedings of the New Security Paradigms Workshop 2020* (Online, USA) *(NSPW '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 45–58. doi:10.1145/3442167.3442173

[4] Paul Dourish. 2001. *Where the Action Is: The Foundations of Embodied Interaction*. MIT press.

[5] Gonzalo Munilla Garrido, Vivek Nair, and Dawn Song. 2024. SoK: Data Privacy in Virtual Reality. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies* (2024). doi:10.56553/popets-2024-0003

[6] Hilda Hadan, Derrick M. Wang, Lennart E. Nacke, and Leah Zhang-Kennedy. 2024. Privacy in Immersive Extended Reality: Exploring User Perceptions, Concerns, and Coping Strategies. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Honolulu, HI, USA) *(CHI '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 784, 24 pages. doi:10.1145/3613904.3642104

[7] Veronika Krauß, Pejman Saeghe, Alexander Boden, Mohamed Khamis, Mark McGill, Jan Gugenheimer, and Michael Nebeling. 2024. What Makes XR Dark? Examining Emerging Dark Patterns in Augmented and Virtual Reality through Expert Co-Design. *ACM Trans. Comput.-Hum. Interact.* 31, 3, Article 32 (Aug. 2024), 39 pages. doi:10.1145/3660340

[8] Robb Lindgren, Michael Tscholl, Shuai Wang, and Emily Johnson. 2016. Enhancing learning and engagement through embodied interaction within a mixed reality simulation. *Computers & Education* 95 (2016), 174–187. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2016.01.001

[9] Naresh K Malhotra, Sung S Kim, and James Agarwal. 2004. Internet users' information privacy concerns (IUIPC): The construct, the scale, and a causal model. *Information systems research* 15, 4 (2004), 336–355. doi:10.1287/isre.1040.0032

[10] Shady Mansour, Verena Winterhalter, Florian Alt, and Viktorija Paneva. 2026. A Multi-Layered Privacy Permission Framework for Extended Reality. In *Proceedings of the 2025 New Security Paradigms Workshop (NSPW '25)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 50–65. doi:10.1145/3774761.3774916

[11] Abraham Hani Mhaidli and Florian Schaub. 2021. Identifying Manipulative Advertising Techniques in XR Through Scenario Construction. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Yokohama, Japan) *(CHI '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 296, 18 pages. doi:10.1145/3411764.3445253

[12] Vivek Nair, Gonzalo Munilla Garrido, Dawn Song, and James O'Brien. 2023. Exploring the privacy risks of adversarial VR game design. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies* (2023). doi:10.56553/popets-2023-0108

[13] Vivek Nair, Wenbo Guo, Justus Mattern, Rui Wang, James F. O'Brien, Louis Rosenberg, and Dawn Song. 2023. Unique Identification of 50,000+ Virtual Reality Users from Head & Hand Motion Data. In *32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23)*. USENIX Association, Anaheim, CA, 895–910. https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity23/presentation/nair-identification

[14] Josef Nguyen and Bonnie Ruberg. 2020. Challenges of Designing Consent: Consent Mechanics in Video Games as Models for Interactive User Agency. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Honolulu, HI, USA) *(CHI '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–13. doi:10.1145/3313831.3376827

[15] Viktorija Paneva, Marvin Strauss, Verena Winterhalter, Stefan Schneegass, and Florian Alt. 2024. Privacy in the Metaverse:. *IEEE Pervasive Computing* 23, 3 (2024), 73–78. doi:10.1109/MPRV.2024.3432953

[16] Viktorija Paneva, Verena Winterhalter, Franziska Augustinowski, and Florian Alt. 2025. User Understanding of Privacy Permissions in Mobile Augmented Reality: Perceptions and Misconceptions. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 9, 5, Article MHCI037 (Sept. 2025), 17 pages. doi:10.1145/3743738

[17] Viktorija Paneva, Verena Winterhalter, Naga Sai Surya Vamsy Malladi, Marvin Strauss, Stefan Schneegass, and Florian Alt. 2025. Usable Privacy in Virtual Worlds: Design Implications for Data Collection Awareness and Control Interfaces in Virtual Reality. arXiv:2503.10915 [cs.HC] https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.10915

[18] Kelsea Schulenberg, Lingyuan Li, Caitlin Lancaster, Douglas Zytko, and Guo Freeman. 2023. "We Don't Want a Bird Cage, We Want Guardrails": Understanding & Designing for Preventing Interpersonal Harm in Social VR through the Lens of Consent. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 7, CSCW2, Article 323 (Oct. 2023), 30 pages. doi:10.1145/3610172

[19] Phoebe Sengers, Kirsten Boehner, Shay David, and Joseph 'Jofish' Kaye. 2005. Reflective design. In *Proceedings of the 4th Decennial Conference on Critical Computing: Between Sense and Sensibility* (Aarhus, Denmark) *(CC '05)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 49–58. doi:10.1145/1094562.1094569

[20] Robert H Sloan and Richard Warner. 2014. Beyond notice and choice: Privacy, norms, and consent. *J. High Tech. L.* 14 (2014), 370.

[21] Julian Steil, Inken Hagestedt, Michael Xuelin Huang, and Andreas Bulling. 2019. Privacy-Aware Eye Tracking Using Differential Privacy. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM Symposium on Eye Tracking Research & Applications* (Denver, Colorado) *(ETRA '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 27, 9 pages. doi:10.1145/3314111.3319915

[22] Yolande Strengers, Jathan Sadowski, Zhuying Li, Anna Shimshak, and Florian 'Floyd' Mueller. 2021. What Can HCI Learn from Sexual Consent? A Feminist Process of Embodied Consent for Interactions with Emerging Technologies. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Yokohama, Japan) *(CHI '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 405, 13 pages. doi:10.1145/3411764.3445107

[23] Mohammad Tahaei, Ruba Abu-Salma, and Awais Rashid. 2023. Stuck in the Permissions With You: Developer & End-User Perspectives on App Permissions & Their Privacy Ramifications. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Hamburg, Germany) *(CHI '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 168, 24 pages. doi:10.1145/3544548.3581060

[24] Nadine Wagener, Leon Reicherts, Nima Zargham, Natalia Bartłomiejczyk, Ava Elizabeth Scott, Katherine Wang, Marit Bentvelzen, Evropi Stefanidi, Thomas Mildner, Yvonne Rogers, and Jasmin Niess. 2023. SelVReflect: A Guided VR Experience Fostering Reflection on Personal Challenges. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Hamburg, Germany) *(CHI '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 323, 17 pages. doi:10.1145/3544548.3580763