

Designing Value-Centered Consent Interfaces: A Mixed-Methods Approach to Support Patient Values in Data-Sharing Decisions

DAVID LEIMSTÄDTNER, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany

PETER SÖRRIES, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany

CLAUDIA MÜLLER-BIRN, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany

In the digital health domain, ethical data collection practices are crucial for ensuring the availability of quality datasets that drive medical advancement. Data donation, allowing patients to share their clinical data for secondary research use, presents a promising resource for such datasets. Yet, current consent interfaces mediating data-sharing decisions are found to favor data-collectors' values by leveraging cognitive biases in data-subjects towards higher data-sharing rates. Seeking to establish patient-centered data collection practices in digital health, we investigate the design of consent interfaces that support end-users in making value-congruent health data-sharing decisions. Focusing our research efforts on the situated context of health data donation at the psychosomatic unit of a German university hospital, we demonstrate how a human-centered design can ground technology within the perspective of a vulnerable group. We employed an exploratory sequential mixed-method approach consisting of five phases: (1) Participatory workshops explore patient values, informing the (2) design of a proposed *Value-Centered Consent Interface*. A (3) online experiment demonstrates our interface element's effect, increasing value-congruence in data-sharing decisions. Our proposed consent interface design is then adapted to the research context through a (4) co-creation workshop with subject experts and (5) a user evaluation with patients. Our work contributes to recent discourse in CSCW concerning ethical implications of new data practices within their socio-technological context by exploring patient values on medical data sharing, introducing a novel consent interface leveraging reflection to support value-congruent decision-making, and providing a situated evaluation of the proposed consent interface with patients.

CCS Concepts: • **Human-centered computing** → **Empirical studies in collaborative and social computing**; • **Security and privacy** → *Social aspects of security and privacy*; • **Applied computing** → *Health care information systems*.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Health Data, Values, Decision Support, Consent Interfaces, Data Donation

1 INTRODUCTION

Digital health data presents a high-stakes domain where investigating the implications of data collection practices is of urgent relevance since complex technologies such as machine learning increasingly find applications [89]. In this context, research efforts advancing a human-centered perspective on the role and treatment of humans when their data is collected are needed [18, 34, 89] to alleviate a current state, characterized by a misalignment between the values of “*those who contribute data and those who use data*” [34]. This mismatch manifests itself in the design of consent interfaces that mediate people’s data-sharing decisions. Common design patterns and best practices for consent interfaces have received criticism for only superficially complying with legal requirements for informed consent.¹ Existing consent interfaces, thus, largely nudge their

¹These legal requirements are defined within the EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) [32] or the US California Privacy Rights Act (CPRA) [24]. A recent study analyzed consent interfaces on the UK’s top 10,000 most visited websites, finding that implied consent (i.e., consent not given explicitly) and paternalistic nudges towards higher data-sharing rates were ubiquitous, while only 12 % of consent interfaces met the minimum requirements of the GDPR [69].

users to base their data-sharing decisions on heuristics and cognitive biases rather than rational deliberation [3, 58, 69, 84], leading people to act in ways that may be inconsistent and potentially disadvantage their personal values [3, 85].

To counteract such exploitation of heuristic decision-making patterns, approaches have been proposed to support individuals' data-sharing decisions by designing interfaces that encourage users to make reflective decisions [1, 47, 51]. However, these approaches have not yet been applied to high-stakes domains involving sensitive data, such as digital healthcare. Here, a need for increased procedural transparency has been expressed [50], along with measures for supporting patients in making informed data-sharing decisions [31]. On a technological level, these issues concerning the modes in which consent interfaces shape data collection practices (i.e., through unconscious disclosures or exclusion of vulnerable groups) raise ethical concerns about the use of data collected in this way and the quality of the resulting datasets [89], specifically in terms of resulting biases and a failure to recognize what values are present or missing therein [77]. To approach technology design (e.g., for consent interfaces) grounded within a situated understanding of the values of its end-users (e.g., those who contribute their data), participatory approaches within human-centered design present a way to designing technology that represents those values [14, 91]. Work across Computer-Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW) [31, 50, 77, 89] and Human-Computer Interaction (HCI) [31, 91] noted a lack of studies applying participatory approaches to examine data-sharing processes within their socio-technical contexts and from the perspective of people making their data available. Digital health presents a particularly intriguing domain for such research efforts as the secondary use of routinely collected patient data represents a promising source for constructing datasets that are fueling data-driven innovations in medicine [29, 39], yet the processes by which these data sets are obtained may keep patients from making informed decisions [57]. Addressing these needs, our research seeks to explore the design space for supporting end-users' values in health-data sharing, asking: *"How can human-centered approaches inform the design of consent interface that supports people in making data-sharing decisions consistent with their values in the medical context?"*. Methodically, we follow an exploratory sequential mixed-methods approach (see [25]), combining qualitative and quantitative methods. Hereby, the initial qualitative phase (i.e., eliciting people's values through participatory workshops) serves to ground the conceptualization of our value-centered consent interface in the views of patients. The following quantitative phase evaluates the effects of our proposed interface elements through an online experiment, examining to what degree these interface elements succeed in supporting value-congruent decision-making. Next, we conduct co-creation workshop with subject experts to finalize a high-fidelity prototype, that is consequently evaluated in a digital health data donation application context with inpatients at a university hospital. Our research offers the following contributions to the CSCW community, advancing the field of consent interface design in the context of data sharing:

- (1) *Mixed-Method Approach to Human-Centered Interface Design*: We combine qualitative and quantitative methods within an exploratory sequential study and convey how this approach helped us to align our consent interface designs with patients' values and preferences regarding data sharing.
- (2) *Value-Centered Reflection Prompt*: We propose a novel design element for a consent interface that fosters value-congruent decision-making. This *Value-Centered Reflection Prompt* encourages people to reflect on their values and consider them in the decision-making process.
- (3) *Situated Application*: We carried out a domain-specific adaptation of our proposed interface concept within a hospital context to evaluate the situated applicability of our user interface design by integrating insights from multiple stakeholders.

This research effort consists of five subsequent phases, which are reported as follows: First, relevant literature regarding privacy decision-making, consent interface design, and supporting end-user values is reviewed (see [Section 2](#)). Next, our participatory patient workshop and the resulting design requirements are discussed (see [Section 5](#)) and consequently translated into an interface concept in the design phase (see [Section 6](#)). We then evaluate the effect of the proposed interface interventions in an online experiment (see [Section 7](#)) before applying it to a real-world application context of health data donation, where we conduct a co-creation workshop with subject experts (see [Section 8](#)) and user evaluations with patients (see [Section 9](#)).

2 RELATED WORK

In approaching the design space for consent interfaces, we first (1) highlight value-congruence as a quality indicator for decisions, then (2) detail how individuals derive data-sharing decisions, and (3) describe ways in which interface design can support end-users in making decisions consistent with their personal values.

2.1 Value-Congruence as Quality Indicator for Informed Decisions

The design of consent interfaces is beholden to legal frameworks, such as the GDPR, postulating that individuals should be able to control the conditions under which third parties process and store their data by actively giving informed consent [81, 82]. Hence, when approaching the design of consent interfaces that support end-user decision-making, we are immediately confronted with the question of what constitutes an informed decision for a given individual. The most comprehensive conceptualization of informed decision-making stems from the medical field, where it has been investigated extensively within the context of patient-oriented decision-support [37, 66]. Two elements are thereby considered fundamental: First, a decision must be based on relevant knowledge, and second, it must be congruent with the patient's values [67, 90]. Value congruence describes this match between a selected choice and the decision-maker's values. Values are hereby understood to be an individual's attitudes² toward the outcomes or attributes of the available options [67]. Value congruence presents the key component of decision quality, because even if there is good knowledge of the options available, if the option chosen does not align with the decision maker's values, it cannot be a quality decision [67]. In light of the central role, values play in determining the quality of a given decision, promoting value clarification, i.e., the process of determining what is important to an individual in the context of a given decision, is key to supporting an individual's decision-making process [90]. Previous work has demonstrated how value clarification can serve to integrate patient values in a digital health context: Lim et al. [59] argue that the values of patients may not align with the expectations of other clinical stakeholders, i.e., healthcare providers. To examine patient values, patients were given a worksheet with questions and value cards to contextualize, assess, and reflect on their health-related needs [59]. The authors conclude that such an approach can support patients in gaining a deeper understanding of their values and help them reflect on their self-care, providing valuable directions for designing healthcare technologies fostering these values. Similarly, Berry et al. [12] show how supporting patients in exploring and articulating their personal values creates an understanding, which can consequently serve as a valuable perspective for critiquing the current state of healthcare and envisioning possible ideal futures.

²Please note that within the medical literature on informed decision-making, the terms values, attitudes, and preferences are used synonymously [67]. Within HCI, Friedman et al. [36] argue for the importance of values in decision-making, describing them as "what is important to people in their lives, with a focus on ethics and morality".

In summary, when assessing the quality of a decision from a human-centered perspective, value congruence, i.e., the alignment of decision outcomes and the data subject's personal values, presents a useful criterion for evaluating the quality of a decision. Hence, consent interfaces that support end-users' decision-making should target value congruence of decision outcomes as a quality indicator. To identify approaches for supporting value-congruent decision-making, we next examine decision-making processes at the individual level and how consent interfaces influence them.

2.2 Individual Data-Sharing Decisions and Consent Interfaces

Privacy decisions involve balancing the costs and benefits of sharing personal information. However, these trade-offs tend to be ambiguous, complex, and nuanced [1]. Ideally, people would reflect upon the risks and benefits of a data-sharing decision in light of the information provided and their values and then make their choices accordingly. In reality, people typically can only allocate limited mental resources (e.g., through time constraints), leading them to commonly fall back to heuristics or automatic decision-making processes [3]. These cognitive processes are denoted within dual-process theories as *Type 1* processing, describing heuristic, effective, and automatic processing, which stands in contrast to *Type 2* thinking, referring to reflective, analytical thinking that requires the involvement of working memory [54]. Recent research has demonstrated people's data-sharing decisions in online contexts to be largely based on such heuristics [78, 85]. Users have been shown, for example, to agree to privacy notices without reviewing their decisions to avoid delaying their primary goal of accessing the service [69]. While this automatic processing simplifies routine decisions and reduces the effort expenditure for secondary tasks, it risks regrettable decision outcomes in critical contexts (e.g., when it relates to sensitive data) [51]. So-called "*dark patterns of interface design*" [15] leverage these behavioral patterns to manipulate users into acting in ways that may be unaligned with their intentions [3, 85]. In the case of consent interfaces, dark patterns are designed to unwillingly steer people toward less privacy-preserving data disclosure options, as demonstrated by a rich body of research (e.g., [42, 44, 45, 60, 69, 85]).

As the activation of reflection (i.e., type 2 thinking) can create awareness regarding the rationality of a decision at hand [53], its activation presents a promising approach for counteracting such exploitative consent approaches (i.e., dark patterns) that leverage unconscious cognitive processes [58]. Recent work in HCI highlighted the role reflective, Type 2 processes can play in supporting individuals' data-sharing decisions: Cho et al. [19] highlight a gap concerning technology that engages user-driven reflection for supporting people with meaning-making in data-sharing situations. The authors describe how supporting user reflection in these situations helps people understand the potential consequences of sharing their data. Ortega et al. [39] posit that, within the context of making data available for research purposes, active engagement with the purposes of data-sharing can help people reach an informed decision through exploring their attitudes toward the subject data-sharing. They highlight the use of participatory design approaches, integrating stakeholders (i.e., data subjects) to co-design design interfaces that support end-users in decision-making [39]. In summary, we find that people tend to approach the complexity, frequency and nuance of data-sharing decisions by reverting to the effective, yet error-prone type 1 thinking, which works through heuristics and automatic processing. Dark patterns of interface design leverage this behavior to manipulate people into sharing more data, disregarding personal values. Recent work posits the activation of type 2 thinking as an avenue towards supporting deliberate and value-congruent decision making.

2.3 Fostering Reflection in Interface Design

One approach to foster user reflection through user interface design is so-called *cognitive-forcing functions* [26]. This umbrella term describes a group of interface interventions that use mechanisms to disrupt heuristic processing. These de-biasing techniques introduce self-monitoring into decision-making to minimize or avoid errors by preventing people from relying on heuristic processes [17, 26]. In this regard, *design friction* describes the use of momentary disturbances in a user's interaction with a system [23, 82] as a meta-cognitive strategy to activate *Type 2* thinking and disrupt heuristic decision-making [26]. Comparably, Cox et al. [23] discuss *micro boundaries*, describing interventions that design friction into user's interaction with technology by purposely introducing small obstacles into the user flow to disrupt automatic interactions and create brief moments of reflection. Studies have adapted such cognitive-forcing functions for privacy applications: Terpstra et al. [82] posit the use of friction to improve privacy choices. They argue that friction serves as a disorienting dilemma to trigger reflective thinking. Friction can thereby be realized by including an interface element that disrupts user flow and (temporarily) prevents them from achieving their primary goal, leading to reflective thinking as it escapes habitual processes. Comparably, Baumer [9] describes the use of *slow technology* on a theoretical level. Therein an intentional integration of slowness serves to contrast technology design's common target of increasing efficiency to enable space for reflection. Jackson and Wang [51] use a pop-up interface intervention to encourage users to reflect on the discrepancy between their values and privacy behavior. The intervention prompts users to reconsider privacy behaviors that appear inconsistent with their privacy preferences. The authors find that this intervention improves the quality of their decision outcomes by aligning privacy attitudes and decision outcomes. Gould et al. [40] describe the use of a cognitive-forcing function, namely the task-lockout, which halts users from progressing in a given task for a set timeframe to counteract errors made through inattentiveness (i.e., Type 1 processing) and thereby improve task accuracy. Leimstädtner et al. [58] demonstrate the use of a task lock-out cognitive-forcing function to help users make value-congruent decisions by counteracting the dissuasive influence of a default nudge within a consent interface [58].

In summary, we find that people faced with data-sharing decisions tend to adopt ways of thinking that reduce cognitive load through heuristic decision-making. Common consent interfaces promote the values of data collectors by exploiting these cognitive patterns to dissuade users from acting in their best interests. Stakeholder-led, participatory approaches present an avenue for designing consent interfaces that support people's values in data-sharing decisions. Further, we find that adopting cognitive-forcing functions that disrupt automatic decision patterns can serve to support patients in making value-congruent data-sharing decisions. Building upon this research, we seek to examine further the use of cognitive forcing functions for supporting people's reflective deliberation to derive value-congruent decision outcomes. We, therefore, assume that human-centered design approaches are needed, first, participatory workshops to elicit values informing the design of consent interfaces, second, to design for value-congruent decision-making endorsing reflective thinking, and finally, to evaluate the suitability of such a design within its situated application context [50, 91].

3 RESEARCH CONTEXT: DATA DONATION THROUGH THE BROAD CONSENT

To approach the complexities of digital health data-sharing decisions, we situate our research in the context of data donation at a German university hospital. Data donation describes an approach to allow for the secondary research use of routinely collected health data, primarily developed in the context of health research [39]. Its peculiarity lies in the openness of future data uses that a data subject agrees to [63]. From an ethical perspective, this breadth of future applications,

along with the sensitivity of health data, render obtaining informed and voluntary consent from patients critical [38, 83]. In Germany, data donation is facilitated through the so-called *broad consent* (BC). The BC is set to become the new national standard for retrieving consent for medical data donations [93] since a unified, legally conforming BC form was developed to be used across all national university hospitals [93]. However, the ethical justification and acceptance of BC remain controversial (see [41]). For example, doubts are repeatedly raised as to whether such consent can be considered “informed” and fulfill the function of effective permission for the processing of personal data [63]. Further caution is warranted as health data is perceived as particularly sensitive [61], often resulting in lower data disclosure rates and greater privacy concerns when sharing these data [70]. In this regard, prior work in CSCW has highlighted the need for human-centered research to examine such socio-technical issues related to the emergence of new practices introduced in digital healthcare (e.g., the BC for data donation) [20], especially focusing on those stakeholders, who’s needs may be underrepresented in the system design [52, 93]. We have partnered with the psychosomatic unit at a German university hospital that is an early adopter of the BC. This collaboration enables us to conduct our research with inpatient participants for our workshops and user evaluations. The hospital also provides local facilities for these activities. By working closely with patients in this context, we can design a consent interface that aligns with their values and evaluate the outcomes together. Further, such close collaboration with a hospital serves to ensure that the research activities are of direct benefit to the stakeholders (i.e., patients) involved [83].

4 EXPLORATORY SEQUENTIAL MIXED-METHODS APPROACH

The exploratory sequential mixed-methods approach (see [25]) commences with a qualitative data collection and analysis phase, consequently informing the development of a technology. This technology is then evaluated through quantitative means. Following such an inductive approach allows us to derive an empirically evaluated consent interface design that is grounded within the values of patients from our situated research context [11, 25].

Specifically, our research consisted of five subsequent phases (see Figure 1 for an overview): ① participatory workshops, ② consent interface design, ③ experimental evaluation, ④ expert workshops, and ⑤ user evaluations with patients. Each phase informed the subsequent as outlined below:




Fig. 1. Overview of the exploratory sequential mixed-methods approach.

For our initial qualitative investigation, we conducted ① participatory workshops to explore patients’ values on health data-sharing within the research context [11, 35]. These findings, along

with insights from literature (see [Section 2](#)), informed our proposed ② consent interface design, the *Value-Centered Consent Interface*. The following quantitative evaluation served to examine the effects of our proposed interface design on decision-making in a ③ online experiment, evaluating the effect of our devised design in supporting people’s decisions and providing insights informing the consent interface design beyond our research context [35]. Finally, we returned to the research context to apply and evaluate our devised consent interface for supporting data donation decisions at German university hospitals through a co-creation workshop with subject experts ④ and user evaluations with patients ⑤.

5 PHASE 1: PARTICIPATORY VALUE ELICITATION WORKSHOPS

In order to ground our approach to designing a consent interface in a contextualized understanding of patients’ perspectives and values regarding medical data sharing for secondary research purposes, we conducted participatory workshops. For this, we developed a workshop concept for value elicitation, aimed at encouraging patients to systematically explore, articulate, and reflect on their values regarding medical data sharing through the BC and consequently arrive at design requirements informing our proposed consent interface.³

The workshops consisted of four phases following the goal of exploring patients’ values regarding data donation (see [Figure 2](#)). In the first phase, each participant completed a questionnaire (see [Appendix A.1](#)) to externalize their values regarding data donation. In the second phase, these values were contextualized using a value map⁴ presenting relationships between stakeholders. In the third phase, participants used these insights to construct an idealized data donation scenario aligned with their values. Finally, the workshops concluded with group discussion reflecting on the workshop outcomes.

Three consecutive workshops were conducted: The first workshop (August 2022) included patient advocates who qualified as patients due to their own or a family member’s rare disease. The next two workshops (September and October 2022) involved inpatients from a university hospital’s psychosomatic unit.




Fig. 2. Overview of the participatory value elicitation workshop procedure consisting of four sequential phases.

³We provide an anonymized version of the publication outlining the workshop in detail on https://osf.io/9b4r8/?view_only=0b7f26c7c7194c518b6d0dc0510e4617.

⁴ We define a value map as a medium illustrating a contextualized understanding of participants’ values which helps to identify direct or indirect stakeholders [68] and unfolds stakeholders’ relationships and potential conflicts [65].

5.1 Results

In the following, we summarize the main findings that contribute to our overarching research objective by establishing design requirements regarding data-sharing in the medical context; a more detailed description of the analysis and results is found in (*Reference omitted for anonymization purposes*). We provide an anonymized version of the publication outlining the workshop in detail on https://osf.io/9b4r8/?view_only=0b7f26c7c7194c518b6d0dc0510e4617 Our findings show that participants generally viewed medical data sharing as essential for healthcare. However, patients nonetheless expressed concerns about medical institutions (e.g., hospitals) repeatedly asking for their consent, leading to consent fatigue and a perceived loss of ownership over their data. Participants indicated the need to facilitate a better understanding of how their data are stored and processed (e.g., the research purposes or possibility of third-party access). Furthermore, participants shared that consent forms often presented significant barriers, such as important information being buried in long, complex paragraphs or having limited time available within a hospital setting for considering a decision.

Beyond this, our results further highlight a need for “supportive” measures within the interface. First, the participants call for a restructuring of the large text corpus in a fashion that allows access to specific topics that are of particular importance for a given patient (i.e., medical research purposes and data processing). Second, participants expressed the need for measures to render BC processes more accessible, for example, through the inclusion of visual elements.

5.2 Design Requirements

The results of the participatory workshops informed the following requirements for designing consent interfaces for medical data sharing:

- **Reflection:** User interfaces should help patients actively assess the potential consequences of their data sharing, and, thus, provide opportunities to reflect on their consent before deciding. For example, decisions concerning health data sharing could be separated from the moment of medical treatment, or patients should be provided an appropriate time frame to consider the potential consequences of making their data available.
- **Autonomy:** User interfaces should facilitate autonomous decisions respective of patients’ capabilities and needs. Our results particularly highlight patients’ information needs when sensitive data is concerned, aggravated through pre-existing skepticism towards medical institutions or due to stigmatization of medical conditions. In this regard, the integration of a decision facilitator role into healthcare data practices can serve as a neutral instance supports users in navigating through such complex consent processes while accommodating patients’ diverse information needs. This role may be realized through a consent interface that supports patients in their data sharing by answering their questions and educating them about existing data practices (e.g., through tailored descriptions according to varying information needs).
- **Transparency:** User interfaces should ensure transparency regarding medical research purposes to help patients perceive and execute control over their shared data even after sharing it through the BC. In this regard, consent interfaces need to support patients in navigating what is perceived as complex data practices and opaque medical research purposes. In this regard, we argue that establishing mechanisms to support patients in making data-sharing through deliberate decisions consistent with their values is necessary, for example, through providing a well-structured overview of contextualized information (e.g., in categories with appropriate descriptions).

Overall, the findings of our participatory value elicitation workshops suggest that a consent interface representative of patient values should adopt a neutral facilitator role. As such, it should provide patients with the necessary support to address their individual information needs regarding the complex consent process transparently and engage them in active deliberation on the consequences of sharing medical data to derive value-congruent decisions.

6 PHASE 2: DESIGNING A VALUE-CENTERED CONSENT INTERFACE

Based on the design requirements established within the participatory workshops and the theoretical insights from our review of related work (see [Section 2](#)), we propose a novel consent interface, namely the *Value-Centered Consent Interface*. In the following, we detail the implemented design elements, highlighting how these realize the design requirements.




Fig. 3. Consent interface including the *Disclosure Options* Ⓐ selector and the *Reflection Prompt* Ⓑ.

6.1 Fostering *Transparency* and *Autonomy* in Consent Interface Design

To create a transparent interface that enables autonomous and reflected decision-making, we've created a selector concept, that uses simple language, clear structure and requires active decisions (in contrast to the ubiquitous use of default nudges through pre-selection in consent interface [34, 58]). This approach implemented patients' need for transparent data-sharing forms that present data-sharing decisions in a simple and contextual form expressed in our participatory workshops as well as legal requirements of the GDPR [32]. The selector elements are as follows:

The *Disclosure Options* selector is the central element presenting the data-sharing options to the user (see [Figure 3](#), Ⓐ). The options are structured as context-sensitive, categorized information

sections [84]. Keeping sentence construction consistent across options allows for quicker understanding of *who*, would get access to *what data*, and for *which purpose*. This information structure corresponds to the basic information requirements for data-sharing procedures defined by the GDPR [32, 70]. A choice element per option allows for granular and specific consent without prioritizing access to either outcome [32]. For this, we created a “Yes/No” button without a pre-selected default option, based on Habib et al.’s “stylized toggle button” [46]. Users are required to make a selection to proceed.

6.2 Prompting Reflection for Data-Sharing Decisions

The *Reflection Prompt* (see Figure 3, ⑧) introduces design friction to minimize or avoid cognitive errors by encouraging an individual to engage analytically with the decision at hand [17], hence disengaging heuristic processes to help patients reflect on their consent. To achieve this, we integrated a cognitive forcing function aimed to enhance users’ reflection on their privacy choices by deploying a timed task lockout interrupting the expected user flow (see [17, 26, 82]) with the appearance of a *reflection prompt* upon the user’s initial pressing of the “Accept” button. The task lockout is conceptualized through the appearance of a grayed-out, i.e., disabled, confirmation button after the user initially attempts to confirm their selection, initiating a 10-second countdown period.⁵ Users can adjust their selection throughout. After the timer expires, the button is re-enabled, allowing users to continue. This breakdown serves to trigger reflective thinking [9]. The textual inquiry “Please think about your selection! Before you accept your decision, please take some more time to think about your selected data options.” further instigates reflection by inviting the user to consider potential alternative choices (see [9]). In contrast to Leimstädtner et al. [58] use of reflection prompts, we require users to make an active choice, as required in the GDPR [32]. Further, we extend the reflection prompt into a *Value-Centered Reflection Prompt* by providing a representation of the congruence (or discrepancy) between the users’ decision behavior and their personal values (see Jackson and Wang [51], as discussed in Section 2.3, which are collected through a prefacing questionnaire. The realization of this is context-specific and described in detail in Section 7. This value-centered reflection prompt incorporates value clarification regarding a data-sharing decision at hand [90] through two elements: First, a text indicating the level of value congruence – the *congruence message* (e.g., *Considering your answers to the privacy-value questionnaire, your current selection matches your privacy values: strongly*).⁶ Second, a visualization that recalls the current level of congruence between relevant individual values and the selected *Disclosure Options* provides immediate feedback upon adjusting the decision, acting as a supporting measure by representing users’ choices. Using visual cues can serve to attract attention and guide users towards actively exploring the information provided [75]. To derive a visual metaphor, we conducted an interdisciplinary work meeting within our research group. The resulting four options were tested as part of our experiment pilot study (see Section 7), finding a preference for the visual metaphor of two waves drifting into asynchrony with increasing discrepancy values.

The qualitative results of our workshops revealed the need to support autonomy, transparency, and reflection in consent interfaces. As prior work on reflection posits it as key towards enabling deliberate decision-making processes [51], capable of fostering value-congruence in people’s decision [58, 67], we focused the following quantitative phase [26] on an examination of value-centered reflection. Working towards our overall RQ “How can a human-centered perspective inform the design of a situated consent interface that supports people in making data-sharing decisions

⁵ We decided to use a short task lockout as Gould et al. [40] found that longer-lasting task lockouts caused participants to switch activities.

⁶The congruence is thereby indicated by four categories: Strong, Moderate, Fair, and Weak. The wording is thereby adapted from common descriptions of correlation coefficients [5].




Fig. 4. Overview of the data donation consent interface incorporating the *Value-Centered Reflection Prompt* ① accompanied by the four possible congruence messages with their accompanying visualization ②.

consistent with their values in the medical context?”, we conducted an experimental study to establish to what degree our proposed *Value-Centered Consent Interface* succeeds in supporting people in making value-congruent data-sharing decisions through enabling reflection via design frictions.

7 PHASE 3: EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

To evaluate if our design increases value-congruence in data donation decisions, we conducted an online study, realizing the value-centered consent interface in a hypothetical health data-sharing scenario, and focusing on privacy concerns for the content of the value-centered reflection prompt⁷. The experimental scenario (see Appendix B.1.1) asked participants to test parts of a fictional new health data management platform, with contents modeled after the BC forms [8], the *European Health Data Space* [62] and the German electronic health record [7]. We conducted the experimental online study on MTurk over one week in late January 2023. A pilot study (N=24) served to evaluate the experimental setup. Based on the task duration therein, we calculated the compensation for our participants at \$3.00 (\$12.00/h). Our compensation is close to the above-average wage of \$11.00/h [48]. We allowed participants up to 40 minutes to complete the survey to avoid potential rejections in case of slower completions. We are aware that we need to treat the human subject and collect empirical data carefully; however, our university had no institutional review board for research projects at the time of the study. Thus, informed consent was obtained following recommendation for MTurk research [4]. Based on an a priori power analysis we recruited 227 participants (see Appendix B.4). Descriptive statistics on demographic variables are reported in Table 1. Our study combines within-subject measures of privacy decisions before and after exposure to the reflection prompt with three experimental conditions. Figure 5 shows our study procedure

⁷We focus our experimental setup on privacy, as it has previously been identified as a central concern for potential donors of medical data [39].

in detail. All conditions contain identical selection options with general instructions. The first condition REFL contains a reflection prompt and serves as the baseline.⁸ After confirming their selection, the participants complete a privacy attitudes questionnaire, i.e., IUIPC (see Section 7.1). In the second VALUEQUESTREFL condition, participants complete the IUIPC before selecting the privacy options, followed by the reflection prompt with general instructions. This condition determines whether a response to a privacy attitude questionnaire is predictive of value-congruent privacy practice. In the VALUEREFLPROMPT condition, participants complete the IUIPC, then select privacy options, followed by our suggested *Value-Centered Reflection Prompt*.




Fig. 5. Overview of the study procedure.

7.1 Measurements

The following section describes the measurements taken for this online experiment:

- **Privacy attitudes:** We determined participants' privacy attitudes using the *Internet Users' Information Privacy Concerns* (IUIPC) scale [61]. It consists of ten questions in randomized order answered on a seven-point Likert scale.
- **Selection score:** We captured participants' decision behavior through a *selection score*, i.e., the sum of the selected privacy options (range 0-4). The selection score is recorded twice: first, after the initial selection, i.e., before the reflection prompt (*Selection1*), and second, after the reflection prompt is displayed (*Selection2*).
- **Value discrepancy score:** The *value discrepancy score* describes the difference between a participant's privacy behavior, i.e., *selection score*, and *privacy attitudes*, i.e., *PrivacyConcern*. It is calculated as the difference between the normalized scores for *PrivacyConcern* and the selection score.⁹ A *ValueDiscrepancyScore* of zero describes the highest level of congruence.
- **Knowledge:** To assess whether certain conditions were associated with higher levels of knowledge, we measured knowledge retention of relevant information about the data-sharing options provided.¹⁰ The *KnowledgeRetentionScore* measure is calculated from eight questions presented in a randomized order. Two questions are asked about each data option and two about the overall interface. Calculation details and questions are detailed in Appendix B.3.

⁸ We wanted to understand better possible priming effects within the other conditions, caused by answering a questionnaire about disclosure intentions and privacy behaviors prior to choosing the privacy options (see [6]).

⁹ We adapted the value congruence calculation from Munro et al. [67].

¹⁰ We adapted this measure from Betzing et al. [13].

- **Demographics:** Finally, we collected age, perceived gender [80], and education as control-variables, as prior research has found these to play a role in privacy behavior [16]
- **Attention Checks:** To ensure the quality of study submission, we included three “attention checks” [72] across the questionnaires.

7.2 Hypotheses

To examine the effect of the reflection prompt intervention on the value-congruence of the decision outcome, we formulated three hypotheses to guide our analysis:

- **H1:** Based on prior results on the use of reflection prompts [58], we expect the reflection prompt to increase the value congruence of a decision (*ValueDiscrepancyScore*) between the initial selection (*Selection1*) and the final selection (*Selection2*) across conditions.
- **H2:** We aimed to investigate the potential priming effect of answering a privacy questionnaire (IUIPC) before making a privacy decision, as suggested by previous research (see [6]). We expect that participants who answer a privacy attitude questionnaire before making a data-sharing decision show lower *ValueDiscrepancyScore* for their initial selection (*Selection1*) compared to those not answering this preceding questionnaire.
- **H3:** Finally, building on previous research [19, 36, 90], we hypothesized that introducing value-centered reflection into privacy decisions (i.e. the *VALUEREFL*PROMPT condition) would lead to an increased value-congruence (*ValueDiscrepancyScore*) of the decision outcome (*Selection2*).

Further, we examine the correlations between *KnowledgeRetentionScore*, *ValueDiscrepancyScore*, and *PrivacyConcern* as an exploratory analysis.

7.3 Results

Non-parametric tests were used for all hypotheses since the distribution of the target variables did not meet the prerequisites for parametric testing. All tests were conducted with an alpha level of 0.05. The dataset and our analysis scripts are available under an open license on OSF: https://osf.io/9b4r8/?view_only=0b7f26c7c7194c518b6d0dc0510e4617¹¹. We failed to achieve normal distribution for a model including covariance through logarithmic and box-cox transformations.¹² Hence, descriptive statistics of all measurements are presented in Table 1.

H1: Reflection Prompt. To test whether the reflection prompt reduced *ValueDiscrepancyScore* between *Selection1* and *Selection2* in each condition, three separate one-way, paired Wilcoxon signed-rank tests were conducted, assuming lower *ValueDiscrepancyScore* for *Selection2*. None of them reached statistical significance. This rejection of **H1** indicates that in situations that require an initial active decision, a reflection prompt does not lead to increased value-congruence of decision outcomes. All statistical tests for **H1** are reported in the Appendix B.5.

H2: Priming. A Shapiro-Wilk test showed that the assumption of a normal distribution must be rejected for *ValueDiscrepancyScore* of *Selection1* within the combined groups showing the *PrivacyConcern* before *Selection1* ($W = 0.90$, $p\text{-value} < 0.01$). An independent samples Mann-Whitney U test detected no significant difference between both groups ($U = 6752.5$, $p = 0.059$). Therefore, **H2**

¹¹ All statistical tests were performed using R STUDIO (version 2022.12.0), R (version 4.2.2).

¹² We recognize two possible reasons for the negative skewness of the IUIPC [61]: First, MTurk participants might be ‘experienced’ in participating in privacy-related studies and thus familiar with the IUIPC [49]. Because of this experience, they might have responded differently, i.e., communicating deeper concerns for privacy. Second, the IUIPC uses loaded words such as “autonomy” and “privacy”, which, according to Groß [43], leads to a social desirability bias toward higher IUIPC scores.

is rejected, indicating the absence of a priming effect due to answering the *PrivacyConcern* prior to the data-sharing decision.

H3: Value-Centered Reflection Prompt. To test whether the *ValueDiscrepancyScore* of the resulting decision *Selection2* is lower in the VALUEREFLPROMPT condition than in the REFL and VALUEQUESTREFL conditions, two unpaired samples Mann-Whitney-U tests are performed. The comparison between VALUEREFLPROMPT (M=0.54, SD=0.29) and REFL (M=0.62, SD=0.27) showed that the *ValueDiscrepancyScore* of *Selection2* were significantly lower in VALUEREFLPROMPT ($U = 3996.5, n_1 < n_2 = 164, p = 0.018$). In contrast, the comparison between VALUEREFLPROMPT (M=0.54, SD=0.29) and VALUEQUESTREFL (M=0.56, SD=0.30) revealed that the distributions of *Selection2*’s *ValueDiscrepancyScore* were not significantly different between the two groups ($U = 2663, n_1 < n_2 = 143, p = 0.281$). Supporting **H3**, we find the value-centered reflection prompt, VALUEREFLPROMPT, to increase congruence between the data-sharing decision and participants’ general privacy values, when compared with the REFL condition. However, if participants in VALUEQUESTREFL engage with their privacy values through filling in a respective questionnaire, this difference compared with VALUEREFLPROMPT is of no statistical significance.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics per Experimental Condition:
Reported as mean and standard deviation unless stated otherwise.

	REFL	VALUEQUESTREFL	VALUEREFL PROMPT
<i>ValueDiscrepancyScore</i> of <i>Selection 1</i>	0.61 (0.28)	0.55(0.30)	0.56 (0.29)
<i>ValueDiscrepancyScore</i> of <i>Selection 2</i>	0.63 (0.27)	0.57 (0.30)	0.54, (0.29)
IUIPC	5.76 (0.71)	5.88 (0.69)	5.85 (0.65)
Knowledge Retainment Score	2.83 (3.15)	1.87 (2.92)	2.81 (3.10)
Age	40.0 (11.9)	38.34 (13.29)	39.65 (12.28)
<i>Perceived Gender (N)</i>			
Male	35	31	41
Female	49	32	39
<i>Education (N)</i>			
Academic	63	55	65
Highschool or Associate Degree	20	6	14
Other	1	2	1

7.3.1 Exploratory Analysis. To derive a deeper understanding of the role individual privacy preferences and knowledge play towards achieving value congruent data-sharing decisions, we conducted exploratory analyses:

Individual Privacy Preferences. In order to investigate whether the proposed interface was more effective for people with high privacy concerns, we divided the sample into two groups using the overall IUIPC mean scores as threshold: “high privacy concern”, i.e., participants with an above average *PrivacyConcern*, and “low privacy concern”, i.e., participants with a below average *PrivacyConcern*. For each group, unpaired samples Mann-Whitney U tests were used to examine whether the *ValueDiscrepancyScore* of the decision outcome *Selection2* is lower in VALUEREFLPROMPT than in REFL. While no significant difference was found in the low privacy concerns group ($U = 799$,

$n_1 < n_2 = 87$, $p = 0.244$), the high privacy concern group exhibits a significant difference between REFL ($M = 0.66$, $SD = 0.328$) and VALUEREFLPROMPT ($M = 0.525$, $SD = 0.335$), ($U = 1270.5$, $n_1 < n_2 = 77$, $p = 0.003$), suggesting that the value congruence interface is effective in assisting people who value privacy higher toward a value-congruent decision outcome.

Knowledge. A Shapiro-Wilk test reveals a non-normal distribution of the knowledge retention score ($W = 0.96$, $p < 0.000$). Spearman's rank correlation was computed to assess the relationship between *ValueDiscrepancyScore* of *Selection2* and the *KnowledgeRetentionScore*, revealing a negative correlation between the two variables ($r(226) = -0.193$, $p = 0.003$). Our results suggest that overall, higher levels of *KnowledgeRetentionScore*, i.e., being informed, are associated with decisions that have lower discrepancy levels between general values and behavior. *KnowledgeRetentionScore* was further found to exhibit a positive correlation with the *PrivacyConcern* ($r(226) = 0.344$, $p < 0.000$), indicating an association between high privacy concerns and more detailed information retention concerning the content of the disclosure options. To compare the *KnowledgeRetentionScore* scores between the experimental conditions, unpaired samples Mann-Whitney U tests are performed, revealing a significant difference in *KnowledgeRetentionScore* only between REFL ($M=2.83$, $SD=3.15$) and VALUEQUESTREFL ($M=1.87$, $SD=2.92$) ($U = 3109$, $n_1 < n_2 = 147$, $p = 0.033$).

7.4 Design Implications

Cognitive-Forcing Functions in Active Decisions. Contrasting previous empirical research into the use of reflection prompts by Leimstädtner et al. [58], which demonstrated reflection prompts' capability in fostering active, reflected decision-making and improving their value-congruence by counteracting cognitive biases (e.g., as exerted through an opt-out nudge¹³) we find that the inclusion of a cognitive forcing function does not increase the value congruence of the decision outcome if an active decision is required, i.e., no nudge is employed. This indicates that an equivalent presentation of options, following the principles outlined in the GDPR "It shall be as easy to withdraw as to give consent" [32], suffices to activate Type 2 processes.

Value-Centered Reflection Increases Decision Quality. Our results demonstrate how integrating value-based reflection within consent interface design supports the value congruence of active privacy choices, particularly for participants who value privacy highly. This illustrates the role values serve in decision processes and how reflecting on the values that are considered important to the decision-maker helps them arrive at higher-quality decisions for the given situation. In contrast, the value-centered consent interface did not improve value congruence for participants with below-average privacy concerns. In light of the active decision required, this suggests that factors beyond privacy concerns may have a greater influence on the decision to share data (e.g., trust [8, 63] or perceived control [56]). This finding illustrates the importance of encouraging people to consider their own values to support their decision processes through design-friction interventions. While our exemplary use of privacy demonstrated the workings of such reflection prompts, future applications should seek to elicit those values important to an individual before introducing them as the subject of reflection.

The Role of Knowledge. Our exploratory analysis revealed that knowledge is central to achieving value-congruent data-sharing decisions. There was a negative correlation between knowledge and the value-discrepancy score of the final decision outcome, suggesting that increased awareness of the decision is associated with value-congruent data-sharing behavior (see also [67, 90]). These findings underscore the importance of considering end-users' different information needs when

¹³An opt-out nudge leverages the status quo bias, that is, people's affinity for defaults. It is among the most researched and effective types of nudge interventions [2, 69]

designing consent interfaces (see [67]), for example, by allowing access to information at varying levels of detail, enabling individuals to access the desired level of information while maintaining clarity and simplicity.

In summary, we find that triggering reflection through design friction during a decision process does not significantly increase the decision quality in terms of value congruence if an active decision is required. However, if values are introduced as the subject of reflection, the decision outcomes are more in line with people's values - especially if the value in question (i.e., privacy) is important to a given user. We brought these insights from the quantitative phase back into the research context, where an expert co-creation workshop served to integrate the findings of all preceding phases into a situated *Value-Centered Consent Interface*, adapted for application towards BC data donation at German university hospitals. The integration of subject experts serves to provide broader insight on the socio-technical context [50, 91] in which the BC consent interface would be applied and to ensure ecological validity through the inclusion of multiple relevant research domains (i.e., medicine, ethics, design) before a high-fidelity prototype of the situated consent interface is brought into the field for user evaluations.

8 PHASE 4: EXPERT WORKSHOPS

The three-hour co-creation workshop took place in April 2023. We recruited a purposive sample of seven experts who brought different perspectives and knowledge related to the BC context. This included medical practitioners and researchers specializing in interaction design, medical informatics, media pedagogy/education, and medical ethics.

8.1 Method

The workshop was divided into three main phases: In the first phase, a reflection activity was conducted to capture the experts' general perspectives on the application context. To facilitate this, we utilized a set of five activity cards consisting of a task description and prompt (see [Appendix C.1](#)), which participants individually responded considering their specific areas of expertise (see [68]). The phase concluded with a group discussion to share and discuss the gathered insights. In the second phase, we introduced the proposed design through a paper prototype. The experts were divided into groups of two or three and tasked with reviewing and annotating the paper prototype. These groups were encouraged to utilize the activity cards created during the first phase as prompts to suggest adaptations and improvements (see [92]). In the final phase, the proposed changes from all the groups were synthesized. For this, each subgroup presented their annotated paper prototypes, followed by a discussion within the group to identify discrepancies and commonalities in the experts' perspectives.

To analyze the workshop results, we transcribed the presentation of the annotated paper prototypes verbatim, supplementing it with our notes. Through qualitative content analysis, i.e., inductive category formation following Mayring [p. 79-81] [64], the first author of this paper examined the proposed changes and open questions on the interface. The resulting codes were then consolidated into categories of improvement described below:

8.2 Summary of Findings

Based on our analysis, we identified four main categories of improvement: (1) consideration of contextual factors, (2) accessibility of the consent content, (3) terminology considerations regarding the use of "values", and (4) focus on personal value-centered reflection, rather than congruence calculations.

The experts unanimously agreed on the need to strongly consider contextual factors when adapting the *Value-Centered Consent Interface* to BC data donation. They highlighted the need




Fig. 6. Overview of co-creation workshop procedure. First, activity cards (left) help experts anticipate and assess the context and the data donation user interface as a paper prototype (right) that allows hands-on interaction and direct commentary.

to provide patients with information on the benefits and risks of donating medical data, mainly since data donation frequently constitutes a secondary task for those admitted to a hospital. To address this, the experts suggested adapting multi-modal information presentation, for example, by incorporating an explanatory video that can effectively convey the necessary information with reduced cognitive effort compared to the text format.

Further, criticism was expressed regarding the length and complexity of the BC data donation form, noting that it may be inaccessible to most patients. As a solution, an easy-to-understand summary alongside the original document was recommended. Additionally, some experts proposed utilizing a multi-layer information provision format that accommodates different learning styles, allowing for individual user flows and improving user control.

Concerns were raised, particularly among medical experts, regarding the use of the term “value” in the context of medical data donation. This term may be misleading, potentially leading to associations with medical values such as blood values. To address this, the experts suggested using alternative terminology (i.e., speaking of “important aspects”) to avoid confusion.

The experts emphasized that the specification of personal values should not be used to calculate a value congruence score, as it would contradict the principle of data minimization¹⁴. Instead, the explication of personal values should serve exclusively for the individual’s reflection rather than for any scoring or measurement purposes.

8.3 Design Implications

The results from our expert evaluation have led us to improve our situated *Value-Centered Consent Interface* further: First, the feedback received during the expert workshops regarding the inaccessibility of the lengthy and verbose BC text aligns with the challenges identified in our value elicitation workshops (see Section 5). To address this, we propose expanding the contextual information available to patients before making a data-sharing decision. This can be achieved through a composite information approach, where users can access information of varying specificity step-by-step based on individual needs. Specifically, the following design elements have been adopted:

- Segmentation of the overall BC form text into smaller, self-contained sections on separate sub-pages, following a consistent and simple syntactic and lexical structure. Additional

¹⁴ According to §3 a of the German Federal Data Protection Act (BDSG), public and non-public bodies that handle personal data should always operate under the condition that they only store, use, or process as much data as is necessary for the purpose in question.

information can thereby be accessed by those users who require a deeper understanding of specific aspects.

- Implementation of a multi-linear navigation system that allows users to navigate between sub-sections of the BC, accommodating different learning styles and enabling users to access the information they need quickly.

Second, we recognized the need to adapt our value-reflection approach to better suit the BC context and the variety of personal values that may impact data-sharing decisions in a real-life setting. This is achieved by adapting a qualitative approach to the context of the value-centered reflection prompt. For this, users are asked a set of value-elicitation questions.¹⁵ These questions can be found in [Appendix C.2](#). The reflection prompt consequently presents patients with their answers through a time-out design friction once data-sharing decisions have been made [82]. To avoid the “value” terminology confusion brought about by our expert panel, we adapted phrasing similar to Friedman et al.’s [36] value definition to convey what values ought to be the subject of reflection without explicitly referring to “values”. Finally, a multi-layered information provision approach was adapted to accommodate differing information needs, incorporating an explanation video, an FAQ section, and popups explaining uncommon concepts (e.g., pseudonymization). By implementing these design recommendations, we aim to enhance the accessibility, clarity, and user experience of the BC data donation interfaces, promoting informed decision-making and value alignment.

Hence, after an exploration of patient values through participatory workshops (see [Section 5](#)), a quantitative examination of design friction as intervention for increasing value-congruence through triggering reflection (see [Section 7](#)), and a co-creation workshop with subject experts (see [Section 8](#)), the findings were integrated and realized via a functional, high fidelity prototype. This prototype was brought back to the application context to be tested with inpatients at a German university hospital psychosomatic unit for examining whether patients perceived the *Value-Centered Consent Interface* as supporting their health data donation decisions.

9 PHASE 5: USER EVALUATIONS

For the user evaluation of the situated *Value-Centered Consent Interface*, participants followed through a data donation decision process using a high-fidelity prototype, followed by a semi-structured interview and a usability survey. Ethics approval for this study was obtained through the ethics committee of a German university hospital. This study aimed to examine the extent to which the value-centered consent interface is perceived as supporting value-congruent decisions by end-users within a sociotechnical context, namely health data donation for patients of a university hospital.

9.1 Method

The user evaluation was conducted in-lab with twelve inpatients from the psychosomatic unit of a university hospital in December 2023 (N=6) and January 2024 (N=6). The participants’ average age was 46,75 years (SD = 16,29). The study procedure was as follows: After providing informed consent, the participants read the scenario text (see [Appendix D.1](#)). Next, each participant interacted with the prototype to make a hypothetical decision regarding a health data donation. This interaction took, on average, 18.10 minutes (SD = 4.92). Next, a semi-structured interview was conducted reviewing the experience of interacting with the prototype, followed by a short survey including

¹⁵The questions are based on the four bioethics principles, aimed at supporting patients in their self-determination and informed decision (i.e., beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, justice) [89].




Fig. 7. This figure presents the time-out design friction in the *value-centered consent interface* adapted to the BC research context after the subject expert co-creation workshop. The text has been translated into English.

UEQ-S¹⁶ and demographic variables. The interview questions are reported in [Appendix D.2](#). The interview sessions were audio recorded and consequently transcribed verbatim. The transcripts were analyzed following Mayrings [64, p. 79-81] procedure for inductive category formation in qualitative content analysis, which is especially suitable for material retrieved from open interview processes. Based on the theoretical ([Section 2](#), [Section 6](#)) and empirical ([Section 7](#)) considerations, it was the goal of this analysis to examine (1) how participants' decision processes take place while interacting with the *Value-Centered Consent Interface*, as well as (2) how they perceive the overall consent interface, and (3) the value reflection prompt in particular, to be supportive to users' decision-making processes.

9.2 Summary of Findings

Overall, participants emphasized the comprehensibility of the data donation decision process. They found the information to be well-structured and sufficiently detailed. In particular, the segmentation of the overall information into separate, concise text segments was positively received, highlighting the availability and utility of additional information through pop-ups. This is further underscored by the results of the UEQ-S, showing an overall positive perception of the proposed interface's usability, rating it to be *supportive* ($M=6$, $SD=1.76$), *easy* ($M=6.67$, $SD=0.89$), *clear* ($M=6$, $SD=1.41$) and *interesting* ($M=6.6$, $SD=0.78$). For the perceived level of innovation, the patients' ratings were marginally lower and more varied: *exciting* ($M=5.5$, $SD=2.28$), *leading edge* ($M=5.92$, $SD=1.84$) and *inventing* ($M=6$, $SD=1.21$). The lowest score concerned *efficiency* ($M=5.75$, $SD=2.14$), reflecting some participants' concerns about text length and high page count. The multi-modal presentation of information (suggested in our expert workshops and realized via explanatory video) was described

¹⁶The short version of the "User Experience Questionnaire (UEQ)" is a standard measure for the usability of a user interface [79].

as particularly helpful for understanding the decision context at hand. This finding echoes patients' calls for the inclusion of multimedia elements in our value-elicitation workshops (see [Section 5](#), highlighting the increased efficiency of such elements compared to textual descriptions. Beyond this, some patients further suggested providing more specialized information provision measures, such as a support hotline.

Value-Centered Reflection Prompt. The participants indicated that engaging with the value-centered reflection prompt assisted them in comprehending and organizing their intentions in light of their specified values. In particular, reviewing their decision outcomes after being displayed the values they had initially entered enabled them to gain a sense of control and deliberation in making a data donation decision. Participant (P2) described the reflection process as follows: “*I thought it [i.e., the Value-Centered Reflection Prompt] was good because I actually read through the options again and then briefly considered changing it again.*”. Respondents described the reflection questions as helpful in explicating their intentions and gaining a broader perspective. The wording of these questions was generally perceived as easy to understand and helpful. However, one participant voiced concerns that some vocabulary may not be accessible to those speaking German as a secondary language, pledging for a most simple wording where possible.

Values Guide Individual Decision Behaviour. Overall, the findings of our qualitative content analysis show that values play a central role in guiding people's decision-making behavior. Long-term values like altruism, medical progress, or the possibility of personal health gain motivate people to make their data available for secondary research, while privacy considerations (e.g., anonymity and data treatment) are the key considerations dissuading people from data donations. This central role of privacy within data donation decisions aligns with previous findings [39]. The values that are important to an individual consequently shape their information needs. If information needs regarding a particular value (or a salient topic related to it) cannot be satisfied, uncertainty results, and people may be dissuaded from making value-congruent decisions (e.g., they don't share data even though they would want to support medical advancements) as they choose the decision perceived as reducing the uncertain risk. Specific examples of this dissuasive role of uncertainty related to privacy include implications for health insurance (i.e., the need to disclose life-threatening chance findings), doubt about the extent of data disclosure, or the long timescales involved (i.e., 30 years of data storage). If such uncertainty cannot be mitigated by the information offered, patients will refrain from donating their data, even though holding contrasting values. One participant (P4) explicates this as follows: “*So the most important thing that stuck with me is that my data donation helps others. That was actually the most important thing for me, the other thing [referring to uncertainty regarding health insurance involvement] ruined it all.*” Furthermore, we find these values to shape the way the presented interface is perceived: For a subgroup of participants that describes being driven by intrinsic motivation to share their data for research purposes based on long-term values (e.g., altruism), the effort of engaging with the interface was perceived as redundant since their decision was determined from the first interaction (e.g., on the welcome page). The in-depth information offered was deemed unnecessary and time-consuming, preventing the timely confirmation of a preconceived decision. One participant (P7) describes this as follows: “*I'm asked: "Would you like to share your data for research?", along with the reasoning: "It will help you and others. I respond: "Yes, no problem! Where do I have to sign?". I won't look at the privacy policy because, personally, it's way too much for me to take 15 minutes to understand it. You want my data? Let me sign it.*”. This finding regarding how long-term values shape individuals' data-sharing behavior underscores the necessity of adopting a tailored approach to providing information at a level of detail suitable for differing individual information needs.

10 DISCUSSION

The recent shifts in knowledge infrastructures towards mass data collection have enabled large-scale medical advancements [18, 77, 83], yet also exacerbated power differentials disadvantaging the values of vulnerable communities (e.g., patients with psychosomatic disorders donating sensitive medical data) [18, 83], requiring innovative approaches for ensuring core tenets of research ethics like autonomy privacy and consent [83]. Specifically, human-centered and application-specific approaches for improving the mechanisms for supporting patient values in obtaining informed consent for the use of clinical data are needed [83]. Hence, we adapted a human-centered design perspective to design a consent interface grounded in end-users' values within our research context BC data-donation at German university hospitals to establish the design space for consent interfaces that support value-congruent data-sharing decisions. Thereby, we propose an alternative to common design patterns for consent interfaces, which tend to neglect people's personal values by leveraging cognitive processes to nudge data-sharing behavior towards higher data-sharing rates, satisfying data-collectors needs for growing datasets fueling data-driven ventures across multiple domains [84]. We used participatory workshops to elicit patient values, consequently informing the design of our *Value-Congruent Consent Interface*. Next, we conducted an online study to examine the effect of triggering reflection through design frictions in fostering a value-congruent data-sharing decision. Finally, we co-designed a context-specific prototype for the BC with subject matter experts and evaluated the resulting user interface with patients at a German university hospital.

In the following, we integrate insights gained throughout this three-year research effort, discuss how our findings inform future data practices within the digital health domain, and review the methodological lessons learned by realizing a human-centered design perspective through an exploratory sequential mixed-methods approach.

10.1 Supporting People's Values in Data-Sharing Decisions

To approach the design of a consent interface grounded in end-users' values, we began our human-centered design processes with a participatory exploration targeted at eliciting the values of those who contribute their data [34]. The analysis of our workshops conducted to elicit users' values informed our design requirements, namely the need for a consent interface that supports patients in terms of providing *transparency* on the consent process, enabling *reflection* on the consequences of their actions, and consequently achieving *autonomy* in their decision making (see Section 5). We integrated these requirements with insights from literature on value clarification techniques [12, 59, 67, 90] and the use of reflection to trigger deliberate decision-making [9, 23, 51, 58, 82] to conceptualize the "*Value-Centered Consent Interfaces*". This user interface takes the role of a decision facilitator that supports user values in the consent process by both fostering value-congruent decision-making through reflection (see Section 6) and creating transparency regarding the consent process through a composite information approach (see Section 8). In the following, we review the roles of values and information needs within decision-making processes, and how reflection can serve to support patients therein.

10.1.1 The Relationship between Individual Values and Information Needs. In our user evaluations with patients, we found that values such as altruism or belief in scientific progress are brought up as the critical factors motivating data donations. These values are consistent with previous research by Ortega et al. [38], which found that the positive feeling of contributing to science or the prospect of future benefits motivates data donors. The authors posit that these factors contribute to the perception of data donation as a reciprocal transaction in which both parties receive value [38]. Beyond, the values an individual holds important are a central factor in shaping

their individual information needs for medical data-sharing: Motivating values (e.g., *possible health benefits*, *societal gain*) reduce information needs, while others increase them (e.g., *privacy*). Crucially, uncertainty arises if information needs relating to a value cannot be met by the information provided, leading people to revert to the choice associated with the least risk, regardless of its value congruence [67]. This relationship between values and information needs is further characterized in the findings of our experimental study: Therein, a positive correlation between decision quality (i.e., value-congruence) and knowledge underscores the importance of addressing individuals' specific information needs to achieve value-congruent decisions. Within the research context of BC data donations, we find significant challenges related to unmet information needs: Our value-elicitation workshops indicated that the long text form and dense language of the original BC form presented significant barriers to patients, as they could not find the specific information that was of relevance to them. We addressed this issue, based on the insights from our expert workshop, by adopting a multi-modal approach to information provision (i.e., through a visual instructional video) along with a multi-layered layout segmenting the patient information into smaller chunks. Recent findings in personal informatics support using such layered approaches, as they provide users control over the received information, consequently supporting decision-making processes and promoting a deeper understanding of a decision context (see [10]). In such cases (e.g., when it pertains to critical topics like the role of health insurance companies), adapting personalized information strategies can help patients navigate these issues and derive value-congruent decisions. This adaptive approach can also accommodate a positive experience for those capable of making immediate decisions based on overarching values they hold (i.e., altruism), as patients need only be presented with the most essential information to avoid dissatisfaction, fatigue, or even process abandonment. A promising approach for future work that takes an adaptive approach to give users control over their consent based on their information needs is the so-called "meta-consent" [27]. This type of consent interface takes data-sharing decisions out of the respective decision context and presents them on a centralized decision platform, which provides users with control over the granularity regarding data uses and frequency of requests for a particular topic (i.e., always ask when psychological data is concerned) at which consent is required by an individual. This reduces repeated engagement with consent processes to only those topics of importance to a person. Hence, such an approach can serve to counteract consent fatigue [84] and the influence of cognitive biases arising from the fact that data-sharing decisions regularly constitute a secondary task [3]. Future work on the use of "meta-consent" for privacy decisions in digital health also needs to consider the considerable efforts within existing HCI work, such as Cranor et al.'s [33] *P3P* approach to automatically applying stored privacy preferences or Colnago et al.'s [21] personalized privacy assistants.

To summarize, values are a crucial factor in shaping people's willingness to share health data for research purposes. However, these values are tied to information needs that need to be satisfied since the uncertainty resulting from unmet information tends to lead individuals to default to not sharing. Hence, patient-centered data donation interfaces must satisfy people's information needs without causing consent fatigue through an overabundance of information. In this regard, we recommend the use of multilayered and multimodal approaches to provide patients with autonomous control over the amount of information they need to avoid uncertainty.

10.1.2 Reflection and Value-Congruent Decision Making. Baumer [9] posits reflection as a tool of empowerment for those who are at a disadvantage given sociotechnical circumstances. As current consent interfaces often manipulate people through leveraging heuristic decision patterns towards acting in the interest of data collectors (see [18, 34, 84, 89]), we approached designing for reflection by aiming to empower data-subject to act in accordance with their values. Through introducing

values as the subject of reflection before a decision, we expand on prior research, triggering reflection within interface design to aid privacy decisions [58, 86, 94]. Our experimental findings demonstrated that value-centered reflection increased decision quality towards aligning individuals' long-term values with their choices - especially for the participants for whom it matters most: those who value privacy highly (see Section 7.4). This finding underscores the potential reflection towards helping people gain self-knowledge about their values [12] and indicates the potential interface intervention triggering reflection as a valuable tool for supporting value-congruent decision-making in sensitive contexts. In this regard, we provide further insight into the use of cognitive-forcing functions [17, 40] for counteracting people's demonstrated tendency to make inappropriate choices, disregarding good knowledge and conflicting personal values (see, e.g., [67]), especially in privacy-related contexts [51, 85]. The supportive role of value-based reflection is further substantiated in our user evaluations. Here, patients indicated that engaging in value-centered reflection helped them gain a sense of clarity and control concerning their data donation. This sentiment starkly contrasts perceptions observed during our initial value-elicitation workshops (see Section 5), where patients of the clinical context expressed feelings of loss of data ownership and confusion when faced with the original paper-based BC form.

Taken together, our findings demonstrate how integrating value clarification [67] with cognitive-forcing function [26] prompting reflection through interface interventions serves to support patients' decision quality in terms of value-congruence [58, 90]. Our proposal of a *Value-Centered Consent Interface* seeks to stimulate future research that posits consent interfaces as a means to empower end-users towards deliberate and informed decision-making rather than exploit cognitive biases toward increased data-collection, thereby answering the call for context-specific approaches for improving the mechanisms for supporting patient values in obtaining informed consent for secondary research purposes voiced within CSCW [77, 83].

10.2 Data-Collection Practices in Digital Health

Work in CSCW has followed the expansion of knowledge infrastructures from data as a static resource towards recent paradigms of fluid knowledge within *big data* and *open science* [83]. These new ways of how data are used and re-used must be accompanied by ethical considerations on the way people consent to the data collections fueling these advancements, as future uses of disclosed data become increasingly opaque [83, 89], as well new modes of consent suitable for such broad data-uses (e.g., the broad consent [93]). In the following, we highlight how our work on consent interface design integrates with broader infrastructural advances and coinciding challenges in data-driven digital health, highlighting connections between our findings and work in CSCW and HCI, before addressing implications specific to our BC data donation research context.

A recent study on disciplinary values within the practices of data-driven domains by Scheuerman et al. [77] demonstrated how values become embedded in datasets. However, these domains lack a reflexive culture to consider whose values are present in these datasets [77]. Furthermore, in reviewing dataset practices in machine learning dealing with highly sensitive data, the authors identified dehumanizing practices, for example, a lack of ethical considerations when humans constitute data instances [77]. This extends to the domain of digital health, where Wilcox et al. [89] describe a lack of considerations regarding the ethical implications of data collection practices, particularly concerning the treatment of human data subjects who remain largely "*undervalued and understudied*" [89]. The neglect of data subjects' values in technology that mediates consent processes in digital health can entail far-reaching discrimination consequences for the resulting datasets: If the modes of data collection lead to the exclusion of vulnerable data-subjects (e.g., through unmet information needs and uncertainty), this may result in an under-representation marginalized groups in the resulting dataset, consequently risking their systemic discrimination in

clinical decision support systems [83]. Furthermore, a lack of consideration for data-subjects values perpetuates a current state of power imbalance inherent to current forms of consent interfaces, which neglect the values of data subjects for the sake of data collectors, adapting dark patterns to bias end-users towards increasing rates of data-sharing [18, 34, 77, 84, 89]. For these reasons, the investigations of how power differentials shape technology design along with measures to ensure representation of such vulnerable stakeholder groups' values are paramount in domains like digital health, where handling sensitive data and vulnerable populations are significant concerns [51]. Recent work has argued for the need to bring human-centered design methods to topics related to the ethical construction of datasets [14, 22, 89], to empower data-subject groups towards deliberate and value-congruent data-sharing and build towards ethical and inclusive data practices in digital health [77, 89].

Against this background, the present study demonstrates how adopting a human-centered design approach can embed end-users' values into the design of a consent interface, building toward a larger goal of ethical data practices within digital health technology. As we elicit patient values regarding consent interfaces within our participatory workshops (see Section 5), we find that they require consent interfaces to take a facilitator role that supports them in making autonomous and reflected decisions while satisfying information needs related to the choice at hand. Although recent works on data donation have already highlighted comparable needs (i.e., to provide mechanisms for data donors to understand how their data is being used, to protect their privacy, and to ensure the provision of informed consent; see e.g., [39, 89]), current practical applications in the medical domain are lacking implementations, as prioritization of legal considerations (e.g., the GDPR) leads to a disregard for patient engagement and values [28]. The origin of such challenges may be attributed to the underrepresentation of the patient perspective within the development process of said standardized German BC form: Therein, extensive consultations were held to inform the development of the form, which involved *all* national data protection authorities and *all* national ethics committees for medical research. However, only *one* consultation group of patient representatives was established (see [93]). Under such circumstances, asymmetries of influence can likely cause the patients' perspective and values not to be sufficiently considered when designing digital health technologies (see also discussion by Dahl et al. [28]). We highlight these context-specific factors to showcase how the complex design processes shaping digital practices and processes can involve many actors and disciplines yet fail to support the end-users' values and intentions when they are faced with the resulting technology. In data-donation, this means that the decision currently rests solely with patients, who face a number of challenges, including consent fatigue, time constraints, limited mental capacities, and cognitive biases (e.g., [3, 85]). Through showcasing this within our research context, we argue for the greater necessity of adopting a reflexive approach, sharing responsibility, and adapting human-centered perspectives to technology design, rather than merely satisfying regulatory requirements are [34] when vulnerable end-user groups are involved.

In summary, research in the field of CSCW has focused on healthcare as a workplace, where *"patients were invisible apart from being the object of the information and coordination efforts"* [35]. However, the advent of new data collection methods has necessitated the development of ethical consent frameworks in digital healthcare, empowering data subjects to act in accordance with their values. Our present study contributes to a reflective approach to the design of dataset infrastructures in digital healthcare as discussed by Scheuerman et al. [77]. To this end, the participatory involvement of end-users and situated case studies are essential for the design of technology that supports new data practices and challenges the power structures embedded into current data infrastructure. Finally, use the BC form as an illustration of how such power structures within the development processes of digital health might result in a neglect of patient values.

10.3 Methodological Reflections on the Mixed-Methods Approach

Focusing on situated contexts and involving stakeholders is crucial when designing to integrate human values within highly complex application domains like healthcare [18]. For these reasons, we adopted a human-centered approach to the design of consent interfaces with the specific application context of BC data donation at a psychosomatic unit of a German university hospital. Specifically, we followed an exploratory sequential mixed-methods approach [25], which allowed us to ground our human-centered approach to the design of consent interfaces within the complexities and nuances of patient values in medical data donation with the specific application context. Overall, our findings highlight how incorporating such methodological approaches can support technology design representative of stakeholder values [14, 91]. In the following, we review the limitations and lessons learned throughout the phases of our mixed-method approach to inform future applications within CSCW [89]:

Our initial qualitative examination of the application context using participatory workshops and value clarification techniques (e.g., [12, 59] constituted an in-depth exploration of participants' experiences, perceptions, and values related to medical data donation. The workshops provided rich insights into the situated socio-technological context for which we designed, despite not achieving theoretical saturation due to the limited number of workshops (see [76]). Nevertheless, the workshops provided an appropriate and valuable perspective for developing a user interface design within the medical field since they helped us to understand the complexities of the field and the diverse perspectives on patient needs [50, 91]. Putting such an open exploration of stakeholder values and participatory design activities as a starting point for technology design can enable researchers and designers to identify where existing technological infrastructure might have values embedded that stand against those of the end-users [77]. Furthermore, within the qualitative phase, it became evident that an ongoing exchange with our participants as stakeholders of this design process beyond the workshops is crucial to align with the values we advocate for in our work. In this regard, we continued close engagement with patient advocates by publishing the workshop results in their community magazines and providing updates on our overall research progress and publications. The quantitative phase within an exploratory sequential mixed method study serves to evaluate the design derived on the basis of the insights gathered through engagement with a research context during the initial qualitative phase [25]. In order to extend the examination of the cognitive effects involved in prompting reflection to a larger (and potentially generalizable sample [74]), we conducted a crowdsourcing experiment on the platform MTurk. While this platform is commonly used for online experiments (see e.g., [55]), we encountered a large number of data quality issues (see Appendix B.4). These challenges may be attributed to the availability of automated completion and texting tools on MTurk, which might impact data quality. For future research, we recommend the consideration of alternative platforms with stricter account validation procedures, such as, e.g., *Prolific*, (see [71]) to address these challenges. Finally, we adapted the classical exploratory sequential mixed method approach by conducting user evaluations in our research context. These evaluations were carried out in our application context. As the final step of our research process, this highlighted the value of following such an exploratory sequential approach to designing for specific contexts, as the design innovations derived from preceding phases were appreciated by the patients as supportive measures for making sensitive decisions through the BC [61, 93]. For this reason, we recommend that future exploratory sequential studies implement such a final evaluation with the given research context to establish the derived design's applicability in the complexity of socio-technological reality.

Overall, we suggest using an exploratory sequential mixed-method approach to derive a more holistic understanding of the impact of a design intervention in the healthcare context: Integrating

diverse data sources, methods, and perspectives through combining qualitative and quantitative methods within a mixed-method approach allowed us to gain a holistic understanding of consent interfaces for data donation, extrapolating insights to inform a larger discourse on the treatment of individuals in algorithmic data practices [18, 50, 77, 89]. Beyond, we argue that this holistic understanding should extend to the overall research approach, including the establishment of an (ongoing) exchange with a variety of direct and indirect stakeholders (e.g., as achieved through the inclusion of patient representatives, clinical professionals from the collaborating university clinic as well as subject experts from relevant domains) serves to gain a rich understanding of the socio-technological reality for which technology is designed [36].

11 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

Our research highlights the broader need to investigate the implications of new data practices within their socio-technological context. A reflexive approach to technology design requires critical consideration of the values embedded within the technologies mediating data, seeking to support vulnerable stakeholders whose values may be overlooked [77]. Specifically, our research contributes to the design of consent interfaces in digital health by establishing the barriers present in current solutions and providing directions for the future design of consent interfaces that support patients in making value-congruent decisions through the introduction and evaluation of the *Value-Centered Reflection Prompt*. By introducing and evaluating this novel interface intervention, we demonstrate the central role that individual values play in shaping people's data-sharing decisions and information needs. Focusing on the research context of health data donation, we demonstrate how a human-centered design approach can help realize design grounded in the perspective of a vulnerable group (i.e., patients) following an exploratory sequential mixed-method approach. We encourage further exploration and adoption of mixed-methods approaches in CSCW, particularly for digital health. Insights gained through the combination of qualitative and quantitative methods present a valuable resource for informing the discourse between different scientific paradigms at the center of interdisciplinary collaboration central to advancing digital health efforts (e.g., medicine, design, ethics, bioinformatics). Further, this will enable researchers to gain richer insights into the complex interplay between the multiple stakeholders' perspectives and values within clinical realities. In this regard, we posit that a human-centered design approach presents a way to steer against the tendency toward "solutionism" within digital health. It serves to enable digital health practices that empower end-users by creating technology that supports them in acting in alignment with their values.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alessandro Acquisti. 2009. Nudging Privacy: The Behavioral Economics of Personal Information. *IEEE Security & Privacy Magazine* 7, 6 (Nov. 2009), 82–85. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2009.163>
- [2] Alessandro Acquisti, Idris Adjerid, Rebecca Balebako, Laura Brandimarte, Lorrie Faith Cranor, Saranga Komanduri, Pedro Giovanni Leon, Norman Sadeh, Florian Schaub, Manya Sleeper, Yang Wang, and Shomir Wilson. 2017. Nudges for Privacy and Security: Understanding and Assisting Users' Choices Online. *Comput. Surveys* 50, 3 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3054926> Place: New York, NY, USA Publisher: Association for Computing Machinery.
- [3] Alessandro Acquisti, Idris Adjerid, Rebecca Balebako, Laura Brandimarte, Lorrie Faith Cranor, Saranga Komanduri, Pedro Giovanni Leon, Norman Sadeh, Florian Schaub, Manya Sleeper, Yang Wang, and Shomir Wilson. 2018. Nudges for Privacy and Security: Understanding and Assisting Users' Choices Online. *Comput. Surveys* 50, 3 (May 2018), 1–41. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3054926>
- [4] Herman Aguinis, Isabel Villamor, and Ravi S. Ramani. 2021. MTurk Research: Review and Recommendations. *Journal of Management* 47, 4 (April 2021), 823–837. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206320969787>
- [5] Haldun Akoglu. 2018. User's guide to correlation coefficients. *Turkish Journal of Emergency Medicine* 18, 3 (Aug. 2018), 91–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tjem.2018.08.001>

- [6] Tawfiq Alashoor, Grace Fox, and H Jeff Smith. 2017. The priming effect of prominent is privacy concerns scales on disclosure outcomes: an empirical examination. In *Pre-ICIS Workshop on Information Security and Privacy*.
- [7] Arno Appenzeller, Thomas Kadow, Erik Krempel, and Jürgen Beyerer. 2021. CPIQ - A Privacy Impact Quantification for Digital Medical Consent. In *The 14th Pervasive Technologies Related to Assistive Environments Conference*. ACM, Corfu Greece, 534–543. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3453892.3461653>
- [8] Arno Appenzeller, Nick Terzer, Erik Krempel, and Jürgen Beyerer. 2022. Towards Private Medical Data Donations by Using Privacy Preserving Technologies. In *The 15th International Conference on Pervasive Technologies Related to Assistive Environments*. ACM, Corfu Greece, 446–454. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3529190.3534768>
- [9] Eric P.S. Baumer. 2015. Reflective Informatics: Conceptual Dimensions for Designing Technologies of Reflection. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '15)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 585–594. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2702123.2702234>
- [10] Marit Bentvelzen, Jasmin Niess, and Pawel W. Woźniak. 2022. Designing Reflective Derived Metrics for Fitness Trackers. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies* 6, 4 (Dec. 2022), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3569475>
- [11] Marc Berg. 1999. Accumulating and Coordinating: Occasions for Information Technologies in Medical Work. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)* 8, 4 (Dec. 1999), 373–401. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008757115404>
- [12] Andrew B. L. Berry, Catherine Y. Lim, Calvin A. Liang, Andrea L. Hartzler, Tad Hirsch, Dawn M. Ferguson, Zoë A. Bermet, and James D. Ralston. 2021. Supporting Collaborative Reflection on Personal Values and Health. *Proceedings of the ACM Human-Computer Interaction* 5 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3476040> Place: New York, NY, USA Publisher: Association for Computing Machinery.
- [13] Jan Hendrik Betzing, Matthias Tietz, Jan vom Brocke, and Jörg Becker. 2020. The impact of transparency on mobile privacy decision making. *Electronic Markets* 30, 3 (Sept. 2020), 607–625. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-019-00332-3>
- [14] Abeba Birhane, William Isaac, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Mark Diaz, Madeleine Clare Elish, Iason Gabriel, and Shakir Mohamed. 2022. Power to the People? Opportunities and Challenges for Participatory AI. In *Equity and Access in Algorithms, Mechanisms, and Optimization*. ACM, Arlington VA USA, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3551624.3555290>
- [15] European Data Protection Board. 2022. Guidelines 3/2022 on Dark patterns in social media platform interfaces: How to recognise and avoid them. https://edpb.europa.eu/system/files/2022-03/edpb_03-2022_guidelines_on_dark_patterns_in_social_media_platform_interfaces_en.pdf
- [16] Sophie C. Boerman, Sanne Kruijkemeier, and Frederik J. Zuiderveen Borgesius. 2021. Exploring Motivations for Online Privacy Protection Behavior: Insights From Panel Data. *Communication Research* 48, 7 (Oct. 2021), 953–977. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650218800915> Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc.
- [17] Zana Bućinca, Maja Barbara Malaya, and Krzysztof Z. Gajos. 2021. To Trust or to Think: Cognitive Forcing Functions Can Reduce Overreliance on AI in AI-assisted Decision-making. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 5, CSCW1 (April 2021), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3449287>
- [18] Åsa Cajander and Christiane Grünloh. 2019. Electronic Health Records Are More Than a Work Tool: Conflicting Needs of Direct and Indirect Stakeholders. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, Glasgow, SC, UK, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300865>
- [19] Janghee Cho, Tian Xu, Abigail Zimmermann-Niefield, and Stephen Volda. 2022. Reflection in Theory and Reflection in Practice: An Exploration of the Gaps in Reflection Support among Personal Informatics Apps. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, New Orleans LA USA, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3501991>
- [20] Luigina Ciolfi, Myriam Lewkowicz, and Kjeld Schmidt. 2023. Computer-Supported Cooperative Work. In *Handbook of Human Computer Interaction*, Jean Vanderdonckt, Philippe Palanque, and Marco Winckler (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-27648-9_30-1
- [21] Jessica Colnago, Yuanyuan Feng, Tharangini Palanivel, Sarah Pearman, Megan Ung, Alessandro Acquisti, Lorrie Faith Cranor, and Norman Sadeh. 2020. Informing the Design of a Personalized Privacy Assistant for the Internet of Things. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376389> event-place: Honolulu, HI, USA.
- [22] Ned Cooper, Tiffanie Horne, Gillian R Hayes, Courtney Heldreth, Michal Lahav, Jess Holbrook, and Lauren Wilcox. 2022. A Systematic Review and Thematic Analysis of Community-Collaborative Approaches to Computing Research. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3517716>
- [23] Anna L. Cox, Sandy J.J. Gould, Marta E. Cecchinato, Ioanna Iacovides, and Ian Renfree. 2016. Design Frictions for Mindful Interactions: The Case for Microboundaries. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, San Jose California USA, 1389–1397. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2851581.2892410>
- [24] CPRA. 2019. The California Privacy Rights Act of 2020. (CPRA). , 52 pages. https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/initiatives/pdfs/19-0021A1%20%28Consumer%20Privacy%20-%20Version%203%29_1.pdf

- [25] John W. Creswell and Vicki L. Plano Clark. 2018. *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (third edition, international student edition ed.). Sage, Los Angeles London New Delhi Singapore Washington DC Melbourne.
- [26] Pat Croskerry. 2003. Cognitive forcing strategies in clinical decisionmaking. *Annals of Emergency Medicine* 41, 1 (Jan. 2003), 110–120. <https://doi.org/10.1067/mem.2003.22>
- [27] Annabelle Cumyn, Adrien Barton, Roxanne Dault, Nissrine Safa, Anne-Marie Cloutier, and Jean-François Ethier. 2021. Meta-consent for the secondary use of health data within a learning health system: a qualitative study of the public's perspective. *BMC Medical Ethics* 22, 1 (June 2021), 81. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-021-00647-x>
- [28] Yngve Dahl and Dag Svanæs. 2020. Facilitating Democracy: Concerns from Participatory Design with Asymmetric Stakeholder Relations in Health Care. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, Honolulu HI USA, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376805>
- [29] Melanie Duckert and Louise Barkhuus. 2022. Protecting Personal Health Data through Privacy Awareness: A study of perceived data privacy among people with chronic or long-term illness. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 6, GROUP (Jan. 2022), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3492830>
- [30] Marc Dupuis, Karen Renaud, and Rosalind Searle. 2022. Crowdsourcing Quality Concerns: An Examination of Amazon's Mechanical Turk. In *The 23rd Annual Conference on Information Technology Education*. ACM, Chicago IL USA, 127–129. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3537674.3555783>
- [31] Rachel Eardley, Emma L. Tonkin, Ewan Soubutts, Amid Ayobi, Gregory J. L. Tourte, Rachael Gooberman-Hill, Ian Craddock, and Aisling Ann O'Kane. 2023. Explanation before Adoption: Supporting Informed Consent for Complex Machine Learning and IoT Health Platforms. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 7, CSCW1 (April 2023), 49:1–49:25. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3579482>
- [32] European Commission. 2016. Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation). <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/679/oj>
- [33] Lorrie Faith Cranor. 2011. Platform for Privacy Preferences (P3P). In *Encyclopedia of Cryptography and Security*, Henk C. A. van Tilborg and Sushil Jajodia (Eds.). Springer US, Boston, MA, 940–941. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-5906-5_759
- [34] Matthias Fassl, Lea Theresa Gröber, and Katharina Krombholz. 2021. Stop the Consent Theater. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, Yokohama Japan, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3411763.3451230>
- [35] Geraldine Fitzpatrick and Gunnar Ellingsen. 2013. A Review of 25 Years of CSCW Research in Healthcare: Contributions, Challenges and Future Agendas. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)* 22, 4-6 (Aug. 2013), 609–665. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10606-012-9168-0>
- [36] Batya Friedman, David G. Hendry, and Alan Borning. 2017. A Survey of Value Sensitive Design Methods. *Foundations and Trends® in Human-Computer Interaction* 11, 2 (2017), 63–125. <https://doi.org/10.1561/11000000015>
- [37] Alex Ghanouni, Cristina Renzi, Susanne F Meisel, and Jo Waller. 2016. Common methods of measuring 'informed choice' in screening participation: Challenges and future directions. *Preventive Medicine Reports* 4 (Dec. 2016), 601–607. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmedr.2016.10.017>
- [38] Alejandra Gomez Ortega, Jacky Bourgeois, Wiebke Toussaint Hutiri, and Gerd Kortuem. 2023. Beyond data transactions: a framework for meaningfully informed data donation. *AI & SOCIETY* (Aug. 2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-023-01755-5>
- [39] Alejandra Gomez Ortega, Jacky Bourgeois, and Gerd Kortuem. 2021. Towards Designably Data Donation. In *Adjunct Proceedings of the 2021 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing and Proceedings of the 2021 ACM International Symposium on Wearable Computers*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 496–501. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3460418.3479362>
- [40] Sandy J.J. Gould, Anna L. Cox, and Duncan P. Brumby. 2015. Task Lockouts Induce Crowdworkers to Switch to Other Activities. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI EA '15)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1785–1790. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2702613.2732709>
- [41] Christine Grady, Lisa Eckstein, Ben Berkman, Dan Brock, Robert Cook-Deegan, Stephanie M. Fullerton, Hank Greely, Mats G. Hansson, Sara Hull, Scott Kim, and others. 2015. Broad Consent for Research with Biological Samples: Workshop Conclusions. *The American Journal of Bioethics* 15, 9 (2015), 34–42. Publisher: Taylor & Francis.
- [42] Paul Graßl, Hanna Schraffenberger, Frederik Zuiderveen Borgesius, and Moniek Buijzen. 2021. Dark and Bright Patterns in Cookie Consent Requests. *Journal of Digital Social Research* 3, 11 (2021), 1–38. <https://doi.org/10.33621/jdsr.v3i1.54>
- [43] Thomas Groß. 2021. Validity and Reliability of the Scale Internet Users' Information Privacy Concerns (IUIPC). *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies* 2021, 2 (April 2021), 235–258. <https://doi.org/10.2478/popets-2021-0026>

- [44] Johanna Gunawan, Amogh Pradeep, David Choffnes, Woodrow Hartzog, and Christo Wilson. 2021. A Comparative Study of Dark Patterns Across Web and Mobile Modalities. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 5, CSCW2 (Oct. 2021), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3479521>
- [45] Hana Habib, Megan Li, Ellie Young, and Lorrie Cranor. 2022. “Okay, whatever”: An Evaluation of Cookie Consent Interfaces. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, New Orleans LA USA, 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3501985>
- [46] Hana Habib, Yixin Zou, Yaxing Yao, Alessandro Acquisti, Lorrie Cranor, Joel Reidenberg, Norman Sadeh, and Florian Schaub. 2021. 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 (CHI '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445387>
- [47] Pelle Guldberg Hansen and Andreas Maaløe Jespersen. 2013. Nudge and the Manipulation of Choice: A Framework for the Responsible Use of the Nudge Approach to Behaviour Change in Public Policy. *European Journal of Risk Regulation* 4, 1 (March 2013), 3–28. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1867299X00002762>
- [48] Kotaro Hara, Abigail Adams, Kristy Milland, Saiph Savage, Chris Callison-Burch, and Jeffrey P. Bigham. 2018. A Data-Driven Analysis of Workers’ Earnings on Amazon Mechanical Turk. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3173574.3174023>
- [49] David Hauser, Gabriele Paolacci, and Jesse Chandler. 2019. Common Concerns with MTurk as a Participant Pool: Evidence and Solutions. In *Handbook of Research Methods in Consumer Psychology*. Routledge.
- [50] Jina Huh-Yoo and Emilee Rader. 2020. It’s the Wild, Wild West: Lessons Learned From IRB Members’ Risk Perceptions Toward Digital Research Data. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 4, CSCW1 (May 2020), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3392868>
- [51] Corey Brian Jackson and Yang Wang. 2018. Addressing The Privacy Paradox through Personalized Privacy Notifications. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies* 2, 2 (July 2018), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3214271>
- [52] Maia L. Jacobs, James Clawson, and Elizabeth D. Mynatt. 2015. Comparing Health Information Sharing Preferences of Cancer Patients, Doctors, and Navigators. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing (CSCW '15)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 808–818. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2675133.2675252>
- [53] Agnieszka Kitkowska, Johan Högberg, and Erik Wästlund. 2022. Online Terms and Conditions: Improving User Engagement, Awareness, and Satisfaction through UI Design. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, New Orleans LA USA, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3517720>
- [54] Agnieszka Kitkowska, Yefim Shulman, Leonardo A. Martucci, and Erik Wästlund. 2020. Psychological Effects and Their Role in Online Privacy Interactions: A Review. *IEEE Access* 8 (2020), 21236–21260. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2969562> Conference Name: IEEE Access.
- [55] Aniket Kittur, Ed H. Chi, and Bongwon Suh. 2008. Crowdsourcing user studies with Mechanical Turk. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, Florence Italy, 453–456. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1357054.1357127>
- [56] Tobias Kroll and Stefan Stieglitz. 2021. Digital nudging and privacy: improving decisions about self-disclosure in social networks. *Behaviour & Information Technology* 40, 1 (Jan. 2021), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2019.1584644>
- [57] David Leimstädtner, Peter Sörries, and Claudia Müller-Birn. 2023. Investigating Responsible Nudge Design for Informed Decision-Making Enabling Transparent and Reflective Decision-Making. , 17 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3603555.3603567>
- [58] David Leimstädtner, Peter Sörries, and Claudia Müller-Birn. 2023. Investigating Responsible Nudge Design for Informed Decision-Making Enabling Transparent and Reflective Decision-Making. In *Proceedings of Mensch Und Computer 2023 (MuC '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 220–236. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3603555.3603567> event-place: Rapperswil, Switzerland.
- [59] Catherine Y. Lim, Andrew B.L. Berry, Andrea L. Hartzler, Tad Hirsch, David S. Carrell, Zoë A. Bermet, and James D. Ralston. 2019. Facilitating Self-Reflection about Values and Self-Care Among Individuals with Chronic Conditions. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, Glasgow, SC, UK, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300885>
- [60] Dominique Machuletz and Rainer Böhme. 2020. Multiple Purposes, Multiple Problems: A User Study of Consent Dialogs after GDPR. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies* 2020, 2 (April 2020), 481–498. <https://doi.org/10.2478/popets-2020-0037>
- [61] 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 (Dec. 2004), 336–355. <https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.1040.0032>

- [62] J. Scott Marcus, Bertin Martens, Christophe Carugati, Anne Bucher, and Ilsa Godlovitch. 2022. The European Health Data Space. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4300393>
- [63] Benjamin Maus, Dario Salvi, and Carl Magnus Olsson. 2020. Enhancing citizens trust in technologies for data donation in clinical research: validation of a design prototype. In *10th International Conference on the Internet of Things Companion*. ACM, Malmö Sweden, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3423423.3423430>
- [64] Philipp Mayring. 2014. *Qualitative content analysis: theoretical foundation, basic procedures and software solution*. Klagenfurt. 143 pages.
- [65] Jessica K. Miller, Batya Friedman, Gavin Jancke, and Brian Gill. 2007. Value Tensions in Design: The Value Sensitive Design, Development, and Appropriation of a Corporation’s Groupware System. In *Proceedings of the 2007 International ACM Conference on Supporting Group Work*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 281–290. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1316624.1316668>
- [66] Patricia Dolan Mullen, Jennifer Dacey Allen, Karen Glanz, Maria E. Fernandez, Deborah J. Bowen, Sandi L. Pruitt, Beth A. Glenn, and Michael Pignone. 2006. Measures used in studies of informed decision making about cancer screening: A systematic review. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine* 32, 3 (Dec. 2006), 188–201. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324796abm3203_4
- [67] Sarah Munro, Dawn Stacey, Krystina B. Lewis, and Nick Bansback. 2016. Choosing treatment and screening options congruent with values: Do decision aids help? Sub-analysis of a systematic review. *Patient Education and Counseling* 99, 4 (April 2016), 491–500. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2015.10.026>
- [68] Lisa P. Nathan, Batya Friedman, Predrag Klasnja, Shaun K. Kane, and Jessica K. Miller. 2008. Envisioning Systemic Effects on Persons and Society throughout Interactive System Design. In *Proceedings of the 7th ACM Conference on Designing Interactive Systems*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1394445.1394446>
- [69] Midas Nouwens, Ilaria Liccardi, Michael Veale, David Karger, and Lalana Kagal. 2020. 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, Honolulu HI USA, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376321>
- [70] Giovanna Nunes Vilaza, Raju Maharjan, David Coyle, and Jakob Bardram. 2020. Futures for Health Research Data Platforms From the Participants’ Perspectives. In *Proceedings of the 11th Nordic Conference on Human-Computer Interaction: Shaping Experiences, Shaping Society*. ACM, Tallinn Estonia, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3419249.3420110>
- [71] Eyal Peer, Laura Brandimarte, Sonam Samat, and Alessandro Acquisti. 2017. Beyond the Turk: Alternative platforms for crowdsourcing behavioral research. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 70 (May 2017), 153–163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.01.006>
- [72] Weiping Pei, Arthur Mayer, Kaylynn Tu, and Chuan Yue. 2020. Attention Please: Your Attention Check Questions in Survey Studies Can Be Automatically Answered. In *Proceedings of The Web Conference 2020*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1182–1193. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3366423.3380195>
- [73] Jorge Ramírez, Burcu Sayin, Marcos Baez, Fabio Casati, Luca Cernuzzi, Boualem Benatallah, and Gianluca Demartini. 2021. On the State of Reporting in Crowdsourcing Experiments and a Checklist to Aid Current Practices. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 5, CSCW2 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3479531> Place: New York, NY, USA Publisher: Association for Computing Machinery.
- [74] Elissa M. Redmiles, Sean Kross, and Michelle L. Mazurek. 2019. How Well Do My Results Generalize? Comparing Security and Privacy Survey Results from MTurk, Web, and Telephone Samples. In *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, San Francisco, CA, USA, 1326–1343. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2019.00014>
- [75] Arianna Rossi and Monica Palmirani. 2017. A Visualization Approach for Adaptive Consent in the European Data Protection Framework. In *2017 Conference for E-Democracy and Open Government (CeDEM)*. IEEE, Krems, Austria, 159–170. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CeDEM.2017.23>
- [76] Benjamin Saunders, Julius Sim, Tom Kingstone, Shula Baker, Jackie Waterfield, Bernadette Bartlam, Heather Burroughs, and Clare Jinks. 2018. Saturation in qualitative research: exploring its conceptualization and operationalization. *Quality & Quantity* 52, 4 (July 2018), 1893–1907. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-017-0574-8>
- [77] Morgan Klaus Scheuerman, Alex Hanna, and Emily Denton. 2021. Do Datasets Have Politics? Disciplinary Values in Computer Vision Dataset Development. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 5, CSCW2 (Oct. 2021), 1–37. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3476058>
- [78] Christoph Schneider, Markus Weinmann, and Jan vom Brocke. 2018. Digital Nudging: Guiding Online User Choices through Interface Design. *Commun. ACM* 61, 7 (2018), 67–73. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3213765> Place: New York, NY, USA Publisher: Association for Computing Machinery.
- [79] Martin Schrepp, Andreas Hinderks, and Jörg Thomaschewski. 2017. Konstruktion einer Kurzversion des User Experience Questionnaire. (2017). <https://doi.org/handle/20.500.12116/3292>
- [80] Katta Spiel, Oliver L. Haimson, and Danielle Lottridge. 2019. How to do better with gender on surveys: a guide for HCI researchers. *Interactions* 26, 4 (June 2019), 62–65. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3338283>

- [81] Alina Stöver, Nina Gerber, Sushma Kaushik, Max Mühlhäuser, and Karola Marky. 2021. Investigating Simple Privacy Indicators for Supporting Users when Installing New Mobile Apps. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, Yokohama Japan, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3411763.3451791>
- [82] Arnout Terpstra, Alexander Schouten, Alwin de Rooij, and Ronald Leenes. 2019. Improving Privacy Choice through Design: How Designing for Reflection Could Support Privacy Self-Management. In *First Monday*, Vol. 24. First Monday, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v24i7.9358> ISSN: 1396-0466 Issue: 7.
- [83] Emily Tseng, Rosanna Bellini, Yeuk-Yu Lee, Alana Ramjit, Thomas Ristenpart, and Nicola Dell. 2024. Data Stewardship in Clinical Computer Security: Balancing Benefit and Burden in Participatory Systems. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 8, CSCW1 (April 2024), 39:1–39:29. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3637316>
- [84] Christine Utz, Martin Degeling, Sascha Fahl, Florian Schaub, and Thorsten Holz. 2019. (Un)informed Consent: Studying GDPR Consent Notices in the Field. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. ACM, London United Kingdom, 973–990. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3319535.3354212>
- [85] Ari Ezra Waldman. 2020. Cognitive biases, dark patterns, and the ‘privacy paradox’. *Current Opinion in Psychology* 31 (Feb. 2020), 105–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.08.025>
- [86] Yang Wang, Pedro Giovanni Leon, Alessandro Acquisti, Lorrie Faith Cranor, Alain Forget, and Norman Sadeh. 2014. A Field Trial of Privacy Nudges for Facebook. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI ’14)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2367–2376. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2556288.2557413>
- [87] Logan Warberg, Alessandro Acquisti, and Douglas Sicker. 2019. Can Privacy Nudges Be Tailored to Individuals’ Decision Making and Personality Traits?. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society (WPES’19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 175–197. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3338498.3358656>
- [88] Margaret A. Webb and June P. Tangney. 2022. Too Good to Be True: Bots and Bad Data From Mechanical Turk. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* (Nov. 2022), 174569162211200. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17456916221120027>
- [89] Lauren Wilcox, Robin Brewer, and Fernando Diaz. 2023. AI Consent Futures: A Case Study on Voice Data Collection with Clinicians. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 7, CSCW2 (Oct. 2023), 316:1–316:30. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3610107>
- [90] Holly O. Witteman, Laura D. Scherer, Teresa Gavaruzzi, Arwen H. Pieterse, Andrea Fuhrel-Forbis, Selma Chipenda Dan-sokho, Nicole Exe, Valerie C. Kahn, Deb Feldman-Stewart, Nananda F. Col, Alexis F. Turgeon, and Angela Fagerlin. 2016. Design Features of Explicit Values Clarification Methods: A Systematic Review. *Medical Decision Making* 36, 4 (May 2016), 453–471. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272989X15626397>
- [91] Richmond Y. Wong and Deirdre K. Mulligan. 2019. Bringing Design to the Privacy Table: Broadening “Design” in “Privacy by Design” Through the Lens of HCI. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300492>
- [92] Daisy Yoo, Alina Hultgren, Jill Palzkill Woelfer, David G. Hendry, and Batya Friedman. 2013. A Value Sensitive Action-Reflection Model: Evolving a Co-Design Space with Stakeholder and Designer Prompts. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 419–428. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2470654.2470715>
- [93] Sven Zenker, Daniel Strech, Kristina Ihrig, Roland Jahns, Gabriele Müller, Christoph Schickhardt, Georg Schmidt, Ronald Speer, Eva Winkler, Sebastian Graf von Kielmansegg, and Johannes Drepper. 2022. *Data protection-compliant broad consent for secondary use of health care data and human biosamples for (bio)medical research: Towards a new German national standard*. Technical Report. 104096 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2022.104096>
- [94] Weiyu Zhang, Tian Yang, and Simon Tangi Perrault. 2021. Nudge for Reflection: More Than Just a Channel to Political Knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, Yokohama Japan, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445274>

A SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: PARTICIPATORY VALUE ELICITATION WORKSHOP

A.1 Questionnaire

With your chosen value in mind, please consider the following questions. You have about one minute to answer each question. Use the first thoughts that come to mind. These can be full sentences or keywords describing your thoughts.

- (1) How do you define this value?
- (2) What does this value mean to you? Why is this value important to you?
- (3) Describe a situation in which this value is given importance.

- (4) Describe a situation in which this value is not taken into account.
- (5) How does this value possibly affect data donation in a medical context?

B SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: ONLINE EXPERIMENT

B.1 Scenario

We illustrated a highly descriptive scenario to familiarize participants and maintained terminology throughout the study to avoid misinterpretations. After being introduced to the company details, participants are asked to test new parts of the user interface of this health data platform. An interactive, multi-page prototype of the hypothetical health data platform was created for this purpose. Extending the prototype beyond the value-centered reflection interface follows the goal of setting up a user flow that is consequently interrupted by the *value-centered consent interface* (see Section 6) as a design friction [82]. In addition, consistent interface design, including a company logo, was used throughout the interface to present a realistic scenario, following Warberg et al. [87] suggestion that non-realistic scenarios may fail to capture risk perception when participants are asked to make “authentic” decisions.

B.1.1 Scenario Text. The participants were presented with the following scenario text presenting a fictional company named “HealthBridge”:

What is HealthBridge?

When you get first treated by a new medical professional, the availability of previous health records can greatly improve the quality of your treatment. Time that is used on gathering already known health information could be spent on medical treatment instead. To help with this, our company HealthBridge provides you with an easy and secure way to receive, store, and share your personal health data. This can include previous diagnoses, medical certifications, treatment results, and data collected through wearable health devices. We offer an electronic personal health data storage solution through an online platform, which allows you to have your health information ready whenever and wherever needed. Our vision is to keep patients fully in control of their data. You alone control what and how health data is stored in HealthBridge: you decide which data should be stored or deleted and which healthcare providers can access your data. Thereby, all data is stored in a secure and encrypted form. We also envision our platform as contributing to medical innovation and increased quality of healthcare overall by giving our users the option of making their data available for clinical research purposes.

What is your task?

We are currently testing new user interface functionalities of the HealthBridge platform. Please imagine you have recently created a new HealthBridge account and use it to store medical treatment results and smartwatch health data. Please answer all questions truthfully, providing answers as you would in real life.

B.2 “Disclosure Options” texts

The following text described the “Disclosure Options” within the value-centered consent interface:

You have the possibility to make certain data available for medical research at universities. This is optional and can help in driving healthcare innovation and gaining new medical insights. You can revoke your consent at any time.

- **Personal contact data**

If you agree, your personal contact data, specifically your e-mail address, is made available to university researchers, only for the purpose of informing you about current research projects.

• **Health-wearables data**

If you agree, your health data collected by wearables are made available to university researchers for the purpose of medical research, in an anonymized form. Wearable health devices like fitness-trackers or smartwatches are valuable for data-driven medical research.

• **Medical diagnoses and treatment data**

If you agree, your medical diagnoses and treatment data are made available to university researchers for the purpose of medical research, without including your name or other directly identifying information.

B.3 Knowledge Questionnaire

The following comprehension questions constituted the *KnowledgeRetentionScore* measurement. Two questions are asked about per data option and two concerning the overall interface. The answer options are binary “Yes, No”, with an additional “Don’t know” option to avoid guessing. The resulting comprehension score is calculated by adding one point for each correct answer and subtracting one point for each incorrect answer.

- I had the option, to allow for my data to be sold to commercial providers.
- I was able to choose, if my home address is made available to university researchers.
- All data sharing options concerned medical research conducted at universities.
- I was able to choose, If my e-mail address is made available to university researchers.
- According to the "Additional Data Options" I can revoke my consent at any time.
- Making my medical diagnosis and treatment data available would also include directly identifying information such as my name.
- I could agree to make my health-wearable data available for university researchers.
- I had the option to allow for my keyboard inputs and IP address to be collected.

B.4 Inclusion Criteria

We received a total of 621 complete submissions of which we excluded 414 for failing at least two attention checks. Following the recommendations for collecting quality data on MTurk [73, 88], we required 1,000 completed HITs with a greater than 95% acceptance rate for workers to participate in our study. However, we had to reject 60.47% of all MTurk submissions, which is in line with recent crowdsourcing studies: Dupuis et al. [30] report a noncompliance rate of over 85% for qualitative responses in their 2022 paper, while Webb and Tangney [30, 88] report that only 2.6% managed to meet the eligibility criteria.

B.5 Table: Hypothesis 1 Tests

	(1) Refl	(2) ValueQuestRefl	(3) ValueReflPromp
<i>ValueDiscrepancyScore</i> of <i>Selection 1</i>	M=0.614, SD= 0.278	M=0.548, SD=0.304	M=0.555, SD= 0.290
<i>ValueDiscrepancyScore</i> of <i>Selection 2</i>	M=0.629, SD= 0.274	M=0.565, SD=0.301	M=0.539, SD=0.292
Shapiro-Wilk test for <i>Selection 1</i>	W = 0.893, p < 0.000	W = 0.907, p < 0.000	W = 0.892, p < 0.000
Shapiro-Wilk test for <i>Selection 2</i>	W = 0.892, p < 0.000	W = 0.906, p < 0.000	W = 0.904, p < 0.000
Wilcoxon signed-Rank test	W = 3.5, p = 0.889	W = 2.5, p = 0.932	W = 8.5, p = 0.135

C SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EXPERT WORKSHOP

C.1 Activity Cards

(1) **Direct Stakeholders**

Direct stakeholders are individuals or groups of individuals who interact in a context and are directly affected by it.

From your perspective, write down individuals or groups of individuals who are directly involved in a health data donation regarding the broad consent.

(2) **Indirect Stakeholders**

Indirect stakeholders are individuals or groups of individuals who do not interact directly in a context but may still be affected by it.

From your perspective, write down individuals or groups of individuals who are indirectly related to a health data donation regarding the broad consent.

(3) **Impact**

Imagine that the broad consent is used at all German university hospitals.

From your perspective, what would be the associated effects for patients?

(4) **Values**

Values can be defined as goals that are desirable, worthwhile, or valuable, that transcend a specific situation, and are generally considered applicable to social life.

From your expertise, what values are important in the context of medical data donation?

(5) **Reasoning**

Select three values you have identified and that you consider essential for medical data donation.

Describe why and how these values should be considered in the broad consent.

C.2 Value Elicitation Questions for Patients

(1) **Autonomy** *What is important to you when you share your data?*

(2) **Non-maleficence** *Do you have concerns about sharing your data? If so, what are they?*

(3) **Beneficence/Justice** *What might be the benefit to you or to society of donating your data?*

D SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: USER EVALUATIONS

D.1 Scenario Text

Imagine the following: "You are staying at a local university hospital as part of a treatment program. The hospital staff asks you to decide whether the medical data collected during your stay can be used for medical research. You are presented with an application that you can use to make this decision. In a quiet moment, when you have sufficient time to think about this possibly new topic, you launch the following application..."

D.2 Interview Questionnaire

Feedback on the demonstrator (7 min)

- What impression did the application leave on you now that you have used it?
- Was there something about the application that struck you as negative? Were there any sections that you found incomprehensible?
- Was there something about the application that struck you as positive?

Interface elements and reflection (10 min)

- How do you decide whether to donate data? Which factors were decisive?
- Did entering your personal needs and values help you to think about medical data donation?

- The application provided you with information in different places and in different forms (e.g. text form, video, questions, info boxes). How did you perceive this information? Which ones were especially important to you or which ones do you remember?
- Before you confirmed your decision regarding data donation, you were shown your personal needs and values. How did you perceive this?

Medical data donation (3 min):

- Are you familiar with the term medical data donation? If so, how do you know this term?
- What is your general attitude towards medical data donation? Which aspects do you find good? What worries you about it?

Conclusion

- Is there anything else you would like to mention about the application or medical data donation?

D.3 Qualitative Analysis: Categories

The valence of the user statements is indicated by "(+)" for a positive perception and "(-)" indicating negative perception.

Individual decision-making processes

- Pre-determination: Immediate decision based on individual values
- Uncertainty: Single aspects compromise sharing intention as uncertainty remains unresolved by the information provided (-), specifically regarding:
 - Long timeline of data donation
 - Scope of data donation
 - Possibility of negative health insurance effects
 - Request: Accommodate individual information needs through e.g. a hotline
- Control: Sovereignty over one's data (+):
 - Feeling of being in Control (+)
 - Request: More granularity in decision
- Privacy: Central consideration for decision outcome
- Motivation to Share:
 - Medical Advancements
 - Personal Medical Gain
 - Altruism

Overall interface evaluation

- Ease of use (+)
- Individual criticism of visual design elements (-)
- Sufficient Information Provision (+)
- Language:
 - Concise descriptions (+)
 - Good understandability (+)
 - Vocabulary: Certain terms not suitable for all user groups (-)
- Multi-modal information presentation:
 - Explanatory video (+)
 - Provision of subtitles for video (+)
- Structure: Multi-Layered Information Provision:
 - Clear Structure (+)
 - Segmentation of information provision (+)

- Possibility to adjust information to personal needs (+)
- Availability of supplemental information (+)
- Text Volume: Too long and/or repetitive (-)
- Request: Adjustment of interface to individual preferences

Overall interface evaluation

- Possibility of active reflection and review (+)
- Reflection Questions: Good understandability (+)
- Provides support against uncertainty (+)
- Reflection Prompt: Decision review provides control (+)
- Decision review: Perceived as unnecessary task (-)
- Reflection prompt: Mistaken as data collection (-)